THE POHLE-PREUSS SERIES OF DOGMATIC TEXT-BOOKS

1. God: His Knowability, Essence and Attributes. vi & 479 pp., $2.00 net.
2. The Divine Trinity, iv & 297 pp., $1.50 net.
3. God the Author of Nature and the Supernatural. v & 365 pp.. $1.75 net.
4. Christology. in & 310 pp., $1.50 net.
5. Soteriology. iv & 169 pp., $1 net.
6. Mariology. iv & 185 pp., $1 net.
7. Grace: Actual and Habitual, iv & 443 pp., $2 net.
8. The Sacraments in General. Baptism. Confirmation.
9. The Holy Eucharist.
10. The Sacrament of Penance.
11. Extreme Unction. Holy Orders. Matrimony.
12. Eschatology.

Other Volumes to Follow:

THE SACRAMENTS

A DOGMATIC TREATISE

BY

THE RT. REV. MSGR. JOSEPH POHLE, Ph.D., D.D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, NOW PROFESSOR OF DOGMA IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BRESLAU

AUTHORIZED ENGLISH VERSION, BASED ON THE FIFTH GERMAN EDITION, WITH SOME ABRIDGMENT AND ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

BY

ARTHUR PREUSS

Volume II

The Holy Eucharist

B. HERDER

17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.

AND AT

68 Great Russell St., London, W. C.

1916

NIHIL OBSTAT

SH. Ludovici, die 18. Maji 1916.

F. G. HOLWECK,
Censor Librorum.

IMPRIMA TUR

Sti. Ludovici, die /9. Maji 1916.

✠ *JOANNES J. GLENNON,*
Archiepiscopus
Sti. Ludovici.

Copyright, i9i6

by

Joseph Gummersbach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION.....

Part I. The Real Presence.....

Ch. I. The Real Presence as a Fact.....

§ i. Proof from Holy Scripture.....

Art. I. The Promise.....

Art. 2. The Words of Institution.....23

§ 2. Proof from Tradition.....45

Art. I. Heretical Errors vs. the Teaching of the Church.....45

Art. 2. The Teaching of the Fathers.....55

Art. 3. The Argument from Prescription

Ch. II. The Totality of the Real Presence.....

Ch. III. Transubstantiation, or the Operative Cause of the Real Presence.....103

§ i. Definition of Transubstantiation.....103

§ 2. Transubstantiation Provedfrom Holy Scripture and Tradition.....116

Ch. IV. The Permanence of the Real Presence and the Adorableness of the Holy Eucharist 128

§ i. The Permanence of the Real Presence . . .129

§ 2. The Adorableness of the Holy Eucharist . . .136

Ch. V. Speculative Discussion of the Mystery of the Real Presence.....M3

§ i. First Apparent Contradiction: The Continued Existence of the Eucharistic Species without their Natural Subject.....'44

§ 2. Second Apparent Contradiction: The Spirit-Like Mode of Existence of Christ's Eucharistic Body 163

§ 3. Third Apparent Contradiction: The Simultaneous Existence of Christ in Heaven and in Many Places on Earth (Multilocation).....'75

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Part II. The Holy Eucharist as a Sacrament 185

Ch. I. Matter and Form.....189

§ I. The Matter, or the Eucharistie Eléments . . .189

§ 2. The Sacramental Form, or the Words of Consecration.....198

Ch. II. Sacramental Effects.....218

§ I. First and Principal Effect: Union of the Soul with Christ by Love.....220

§2. Second Effect: Increase of Sanctifying Grace . 222

§ 3. Third Effect: The Blotting Out of Venial Sins and the Preservation of the Soul from Mortal Sins 229

§ 4. Fourth Effect: The Pledge of Man's Glorious Resurrection and Eternal Happiness 232

Ch. III. The Necessity of the Holy Eucharist for Salvation 235

§ i. In What Sense the Holy Eucharist is Necessary for Salvation.....236

§ 2. Communion Under One Kind.....246

Ch. IV. The Minister of the Holy Eucharist 255

§ i. The Minister of Consecration.....256

§ 2. The Minister of Distribution.....261

Ch. V. The Recipient of the Holy Eucharist 264

§ I. Objective Capacity.....265

§ 2. Subjective Worthiness.....267

Part III. The Holy Eucharist as a Sacrifice, or the Mass 272

Ch. I. The Existence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass 276

§ I. The Notion of Sacrifice Explained.....277

Art. I. Definition of Sacrifice.....277

Art. 2. Different Kinds of Sacrifice.....287

§ 2. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass Proved from Scripture and Tradition.....295

Art. i. The Old Testament.....295

Art. 2. The New Testament.....306

Art. 3. The Argument from Prescription 314

Art. 4. The Argument from Tradition - - - - 322

Ch. II. The Nature of the Mass.....331

§ 1. The Physical Essence of the Mass.....332

Art. i. The Mass in its Relation to the Sacrifice of I"' c'»ss.....

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PACK

Art. 2. The Consecration as the Rea! Sacrificial Act 340
§ 2. The Metaphysical Essence of the Mass . . . 349
Art. I. Some Unsatisfactory Theories Regarding the Metaphysical Essence of the Mass 350
Art. 2. Acceptable Theories Regarding the Metaphysical Essence of the Mass..... 359
Ch. III. The Causality of the Mass..... 371
§ i. The Effects of the Sacrifice of the Mass . . . 372
§ 2. In What Manner the Mass Produces its Effects . 38f
Index 399

INTRODUCTION

i. Names.—No other mystery of the Catholic religion has been known by so many different names as the Holy Eucharist, considered both as a Sacrament and as a Sacrifice. These names are so numerous that the Church's entire teaching on this dogma could be developed from a mere study of them. They are derived from Biblical events, from the sacramental species, from the effects produced by the Sacrament, from the Real Presence, and from the sacrificial character of the Mass.

a) The names "Eucharist" *(ευχαριστία, gratiarum actio),*[1] "Blessing" *(ευλογία, benedictio),* and "Breaking of Bread" (κλάσ« τοὐ *άρτου, fractio panis)* are of Scriptural origin. The first two occur in the Evangelical account of the Last Supper; the third goes back to the synoptics and St. Paul, and to certain expressions in the Acts of the Apostles. "Blessing" and "Breaking of Bread" are now obsolete terms, whereas "Eucharist" has remained in common use in the liturgy and in theological treatises since the time of St. Irenaeus. None of these three expressions exactly describes the nature of the Sac-

1 Not *bona gratia,* as St. Thomas thinks.

rament. Awe and reverence for the unfathomable mystery, together with the discipline of the secret *(disciplina* orcflui), were responsible for them.

The titles "Last Supper" *(sacra coena,* δαπνον ἁγιον), "Lord's Supper" *(coena Domini, κυριακόν* δάπνον),[2] and their poetical synonyms "Celestial Banquet" *(prandium coeleste)Sacred* Banquet" *(sacrum convivium'),* etc., which have a special relation to holy Communion, may likewise be traced to Sacred Scripture.

b) "Sacrament of the Bread and Wine" *(sacramentum panis et vini),* "Bread of Heaven" *(ἁρτοι* ἱπουρἀϊ'ἱο), and such kindred appellations as "Bread of the Angels" *(panis angelorum)* and "Eucharistic Bread," are derived from the visible species. St. Paul speaks of the Holy Eucharist as "that bread"[3] and "the chalice of benediction."[4] Far from misrepresenting the Sacrament or denying the dogma of Transubstantiation, these expressions are in accord with our Lord's own way of speaking, for He calls Himself the "bread which cometh down from heaven."[5]

c) The principal effect of the Holy Eucharist is expressed in the name "Communion" *(communio,* ινωσκ, κοινωνία), i. *e.* union with Christ, union of love. Present usage, however, restricts this term almost entirely to the reception of the Sacrament, as is apparent from such locutions as "to go to Communion," "to receive holy Communion," etc. The same is true of "Viaticum," a name used to designate the Blessed Sacrament with special reference to the dying. "Agape" *(αγάπη,* Love Feast)' and "Synaxis" (σὐνα^κ, Assembly) are now obsolete and occur only in theological treatises.

» 1 Cor. XI. a8*' M'

4 1 Cor. X, t6,

b Cfr· J°bn VI, 50 sqq.

. 0 ctr· H. Leclercq, art. "Agape" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol.

d) Of special importance for the dogma of the Real Presence are those names which express the nature of the Sacrament. The Holy Eucharist, though according to its external species a " Sacrament of Bread and Wine," is in reality the " Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" *(sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi)* or, simply, ''the Body of the Lord" *(corpus Domini),* or ''the Body of Christ" *(corpus Christi).* This explains such expressions as *"Sanctissimum,"* " Holy of Holies," etc.

e) The popular designation " Sacrament of the Altar" was introduced by St. Augustine. It points particularly to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, indicating not only that as the body of Christ it is reserved on the altar, but more especially that it is a true sacrifice offered at the Mass. The traditional title *"Eucharistia,"* which appears in writings of authors as ancient as SS. Ignatius of Antioch, Justin, and Irenaeus, has in the technical terminology of the Church and her theologians taken precedence of all others, especially since the Council of Trent. The Roman Catechism is almost alone in preferring " Sacrament of the Altar." The name " Table of the Lord" *(mensa Domini, τράπιζα Κυρίου)* was formerly applied to the altar on which the Eucharistic sacrifice was offered; later it came to be used of the sacrifice itself, and still later of the communion railing. " To approach the Table of the Lord," in present-day parlance, means to go up to the communion rail to receive the Blessed Sacrament. The original and deeper meaning of the phrase, *vis.:* to participate in the Eucharistic sacrifice, is no longer familiar to the people. The same is true of the word

I; Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharistie und stgape im Urchriitenturn,* Solothurn 1909.
diarist in the Early Church,* London 1901; E. Baumgartner, *Eu-

"Host" *(hostia),* which originally meant the sacrificial victim *(θυσία),* but is now applied also to unconsecrated wafers. The current name for the Eucharist as a sacrifice is "Sacrifice of the Mass" *(sacrificium missae),* or, briefly, "Mass" *(missa).*

2. **The Position of the Holy Eucharist Among the Sacraments and Mysteries of the Catholic Religion.**—The commanding dignity of the Holy Eucharist is evidenced by the central position which it occupies among the Sacraments and by the intimate connection existing between it and the most exalted mysteries of the faith.

a) Though closely related to the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, and in a special class with them because of the kindred concepts of regeneration, puberty, and growth (food),[7] the Holy Eucharist, by reason of its unique character, far transcends all the other Sacraments. It is the "*sacramentum sacramentorum*" because it contains and bestows, not only grace, but the Author of grace Himself. "The Sacrament of the Eucharist," says St. Thomas, "is the greatest of all sacraments; first because it contains Christ Himself substantially, whereas the others contain a certain instrumental power, which is a share of Christ's power; . . . secondly, . . . all the other Sacraments seem to be ordained to this one as to their end; . . . thirdly, . . . nearly all the Sacraments terminate in the Eucharist."[8] The first of these reasons is founded on the Real Presence; the second, on the fact that Baptism and Confirmation bestow the right to

[7] Cfr. Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacrament*, Vol. I.

[8] *Summa Thcol.,* 3a, qu. 65, art. 3.

receive Holy Communion : — Penance, and Extreme Unction make one worthy to receive it ; Holy Orders imparts the power of consecration ; while Matrimony, as an emblem of the union between the mystical Christ and His Church, also symbolizes the union of love between Christ and the soul. The third reason given by St. Thomas is based on the circumstance that those who have received one of the other Sacraments, as a rule also receive Holy Communion.® We may add, as a fourth reason, that the Holy Eucharist alone among the Sacraments represents a true sacrifice, thereby becoming the very centre of the faith and the sun of Catholic worship.10

b) Viewed as a *mysterium fidei,* the Holy Eucharist is a veritable compendium of mysteries and prodigies. Together with the Trinity and the Incarnation it constitutes that wonderful triad by which Christianity shines forth as a religion of mysteries far transcending the capacity of human reason, and by which Catholicism, the faithful guardian and keeper of our Christian heritage, infinitely excels all pagan and non-Christian religions.

This mysterious triad is no merely external aggregate. Its members are organically connected with one another. In the Eucharist, to borrow a profound thought of Scheeben, the series of God's mysterious communications to humanity attains its climax. That same divine nature which God the Father, by virtue of the eternal generation, communicates to His only-begotten Son, the Son in turn, by virtue of the Hypostatic Union, communicates to His humanity, formed in the womb of the Virgin, in order that thus, as God-man, hidden under the Eucharistic

o " *Sicut patet, quod ordinati communicant, et etiam baptùati,* ai *fuerint adulti."* (St. Thomas. *I.C.).*

io Cfr. F. A. Bongardt, *Die Eucharistie der ilittelpunkt det Glaubent, det Gottesdienstei und Lebent der Kirche.* and ed., Paderborn 188».

species, He might deliver Himself to His Church, who, as a tender mother, mystically cherishes the Eucharist as her greatest treasure and daily sets it before her children as the spiritual food of their souls. First we meet the Son of God in the bosom of the eternal Father,[11] next, in the bosom of His Virgin Mother,[12] and lastly, as it were, in the bosom of the Church,— in the tabernacle and in the hearts of the faithful.[13]

3. Division of This Treatise.—The dogmatic teaching of the Church on the Holy Eucharist is admirably stated in the decrees of the Council of Trent.

The Tridentine teaching may be summarized as follows: In the Eucharist the Body and Blood of the God-man are really, truly, and substantially present for the nourishment of souls, by reason of the Transubstantiation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, which takes place in the unbloody sacrifice of the New Testament, *i. e.*, the Mass.

This descriptive definition brings out three principal heads of doctrine: (1) The Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; (2) The

nCfr. John I, 18: *"Unigenitus Filius, qui est* in sinu *Patris."*

12 John I, 14: *"Et Verbum caro factum est."*

13 This threefold relation has been artistically depicted by Raphael in his famous "Disputa."— On the miracles involved in the Holy Eucharist, *v. infra,* Part I, Ch. V, and Lcssius, *De Perfectionibus Moribusque Divinis,* XII, 16.— The intrinsic propriety of the Eucharist in its actual form is well demonstrated by N. Gihr, *Die hl. Sakramente der kath. Kirchc,* Vol. I, 2nd ed., pp. 414 sqq,, Freiburg 1902.

Eucharist as a Sacrament; and (3) The Eucharist as a Sacrifice. Hence the present treatise naturally falls into three parts.

General Readings: — St. Thomas, *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 73 sqq.; *Opuscula,* XXXVII (ed. Mich, de Maria, S. J., Vol. Ill, pp. 460 sqq., Tiferni Tiberini 1886).— Billuart, *Summa S. Thomae* (cd. Lequctte, Vol. VI, pp. 382 sqq.).—Albertus Magnus, *De Sacrosancti Corporis Domini Sacramento Sermones* (ed. G. Jacob, Ratisbon 1893).—*De Lugo, *De Generabili Eucharistiae Sacramento* (ed. J. P. Fournials, Vols. Ill and IV, Paris 1892).— Bellarmine, *Controv. de Sacramento Eucharistiae* (ed. Fèvre, Vol. IV, Paris 1873).— Du Perron, *Traité du Sacrement de I'Eucharistic,* Paris 1620.

For a list of modern authors cfr. the bibliography in Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. 3 sq.— In addition to the works there mentioned, the following may also be consulted: Haitz, *Abendmahllehre,* Mayence 1872.—X. Menne, *Das allerheiligste Sakrament des Altars als Sakrament, Opfer und Kommunion,* 3 vols., Paderborn 1873 sqq.— M. Rosset, *De Eucharistiae Mysterio,* Cambéry 1876.— Card. Katschthaler, *De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento,* 2nd ed., Ratisbon 1886.—*Card. Franzelin, *De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento et Sacrificio,* 4th ed., Rome 1887.— P. Einig, *De SS. Eucharistiae Mysterio,* Treves 1888.—.De Augustinis, S. J., *De Re Sacramentaria,* VoL I, 2nd ed., Rome 1889.— Card. Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis,* Vol. I, 4th ed., Rome 1907.— C. Jourdain, *La Sainte Eucharistie, 2* vols., Paris 1897.— Card. Gasparri, *Tractatus Canonicus de SS. Eucharistia,* Paris 1897.— A. Cappellazzi, *L'Eucaristia come Sacramento e come Sacrificio,* Turin 1898.—H. P. Lahousse, S. J., *Tractatus Dogmatico-Moralis de SS. Eucharistiae Mysterio,* Bruges 1899. —*Heinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmatische Théologie,* Vol. IX, Mayence 1901.— N. Gihr, *Die hl. Sakramente der kath. Kirche,* Vol. I, 2nd ed., Freiburg 1902.— Scheeben-Atzberger. *Handbuch der kath. Dogmatik,* Vol. IV, Part 2, Freiburg 1901.— P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive,* Vol II, 3rd ed., Paris 1906.— J. C. Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist.* London 1907.—

INTRODUCTION

W. J. Kelly, *The Veiled Majesty, or Jesus in the Eucharist,* London 1903.—D. Coghlan, *De SS. Eucharistia,* Dublin 1913.

·) The asterisk before an author's name indicates that his treatment of the subject is especially clear and thorough. As St. Thomas is invariably the best guide, the omission of the asterisk before his name never means that we consider his work inferior to that of other writers. There are vast stretches of theology which he scarcely touched.

PART I

THE REAL PRESENCE

In this part of our treatise we shall consider (i) the fact of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist, which is, as it were, the central dogma; then the cognate dogmas grouped about it, *vis.:* (2) the Manner of the Real Presence, (3) Transubstantiation, and (4) The Permanence of the Real Presence and the consequent Adorability of the Eucharist.

The believing Catholic accepts these four dogmas unquestioningly, knowing, as he does, that they are mysteries which the human mind cannot understand. Theologians, however, love to indulge in pious speculations and view the august mystery of the Eucharist under its various aspects. Hence to the four chapters already indicated we shall add a fifth, devoted to the speculative discussion of the Real Presence.

CHAPTER I

THE REAL PRESENCE AS A FACT

SECTION I

PROOF FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE

The New Testament contains two classic texts which prove the Real Presence, *viz.* : Our Lord's promise recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, and the words of institution as reported by the synoptics and St. Paul (i Cor. XI, 23sqq.).[1]

' ARTICLE i

THE PROMISE

I. Our Lord's Discourse at Capharnaum, John VI, 25-72.—Christ prepared His hearers for the sublime discourse containing the promise of the Eucharist, as recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, by two great miracles wrought on the preceding day.

iThe Fourth Gospel, which alone records the words of promise, says nothing of the actual institution of the Eucharist, no doubt because the author was aware of the existence of four different authentic accounts of this event by other writers.

PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE

a) The multiplication of the loaves and fishes was intended to show that Jesus possessed creative power; the miracle of walking unsupported on the waters, that this power was superior to, and independent of, the laws of nature. Both together proved that, as God-man, He was able to provide the supernatural food which He was about to promise.[2] After describing this wonderful event, the sacred writer goes on to tell how a great multitude, inspired by false Messianic hopes and a desire to see the miracle repeated, sought our Lord and finally found Him at Capharnaum (John VI, 1-25).

b) Then follows the discourse in which Christ promised the Eucharist (John VI, 26-72). This graphic discourse is divided into two parts, the interrelation of which is controverted among Catholic theologians.

While some[3] take the first part (John VI, 26-48) metaphorically and interpret the "Bread of Heaven" as Christ Himself, who, being the object of faith, must be received as a spiritual food;[4] many others[5] hold that the entire discourse deals with the Eucharist and that in the first part our Lord merely wishes to show that faith is an indispensable requisite for the salutary reception of the Bread of Heaven. This difference of opinion, however, is unimportant so far as the dogmatic argument for the Real Presence is concerned, since both parties agree that, beginning with verse 48,° or at least with verse 52, the text must be interpreted literally. In matter of fact,

2 Cfr. *P.* Keppler, */Composition des Johannesevangeliums,* pp. 47 sqq., Freiburg 1884.

3 Toletus, Franzelin, Atzberger, Gihr, *et al.*

4 *Panis vitae — obus fidei.*

5 Perrone, Schwetz, Chr. Pesch, Tepe, *et al.*

6 This is Wiseman's theory.

though there is a close connection between the two sections of the discourse, the second clearly begins with a change of subject. From the 26th to the 51st verse, Christ speaks of Himself figuratively as the Bread of Heaven, *i. e.,* as a spiritual food to be received by faith. Beginning with verse 51, however, He speaks of His Flesh and Blood as a real food, to be literally eaten and drunk. Though the sentence "I am the bread of life"[7] forms the keynote of the whole address, the vast difference between the predicates attributed to this bread shows that, whereas it may be taken figuratively in the first part, it is employed in the strict literal sense in the second. Atzberger effectively summarizes the arguments for this view as follows: "In the first part, the food is of the present, in the second, of the future; there it is given by the Father, here by the Redeemer Himself; there it is simply called 'bread,' here 'the Flesh of the Son of man;' there our Lord speaks only of bread, here of His Flesh and Blood; there, it is true, He calls Himself 'bread,' but He avoids the expression 'to eat me,' where one would expect to meet it; here He speaks both of 'eating me' and of 'eating my Flesh and drinking my Blood.'"[8] Only once does Christ make an exception, namely, where He says in the first section: "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting, which the Son of man will give you."[9] This reference seems to point to an intentional connection between the two sections of our Lord's discourse; but it does not prove that the whole of the first

Tlol?n ıVI,*3Sv 481 ,, *ax.* ›
8 Scheeben-Atzbergcr, *Handbuch der kath. Dogmatik,* Vol. IV, 2, 569. Freiburg 1901.
• John VI, 27: *'Epy&ÇeaOe μη* «^ολλυμίρηρ. *ἀλλὰ τὴρ βρύσιν τὴρ μυούσαν elf* fuf), α/ὠρ.ορ, flp *à* vMj του *ἀι>θρύ* που *ὑμῖν* δώσι‹· r

section must be taken literally. There are several passages which are obviously meant to be figurative. For instance, when Jesus says: "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." [10] And again: "Amen, amen, I say unto you: He that believeth in me hath everlasting life." [11]

c) It is of great importance to show that the second part of our Lord's discourse demands a strictly literal interpretation. The early Protestant contention that the whole chapter must be understood figuratively[12] has been given up by Delitzsch, Kôstlin, Keil, Kahnis, J. Hoffmann, Dieterich, and other modern non-Catholic exegetes.

2. The Real Presence Proved from John VI, 52 sqq.—Whatever one may hold regarding the first section of our Lord's discourse, the second plainly demands a literal interpretation. The whole structure makes a figurative interpretation impossible. Christ's hearers showed by their conduct that they understood Him literally, and the Fathers and the early councils followed their example.

The decisive passages run as follows:

10 John VI, 35.

11 John VI, 47.— Cfr. Franzelin, *De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento et Sacrificio,* thés. 3, Rome 1887; a different view is defended by Tepe, *Instit. Theol.,* Vol. IV, pp. Paris 1896.

12 Cfr. Bellannine, *De ristia,* I, 5 sqq.

John VI, 52: . *the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world."*

John VI, 54: . *except you cat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you"*

John VI, 56: *"For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."*

These and kindred texts must be interpreted literally, (a) because the whole structure of the discourse demands it; (b) because a figurative interpretation would involve absurd consequences; (c) because our Lord's hearers understood Him literally and were not corrected by Him, and (d) because the Fathers and councils of the Church always upheld the literal interpretation.

a) The whole structure of the discourse demands a literal interpretation of the words, " Eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood." Mention is made of three different kinds of food: the manna which Moses dispensed to the Israelites in the desert,[13] the " Bread of Life " which the Heavenly Father gives to men in the Incarnate Word to nourish their faith,[14] and the (Eucharistic) Bread of Life which Christ Himself promises to give to His followers.[15] The manna was a thing of the past, a transitory food incapable of warding off death. The Bread of Heaven, *i. e.,* the Son of God made man, is of the present and constitutes, in as far as it is accepted, a means to spiritual life. The third kind of food, which Christ Himself promises to give at a future time, is new and essentially different, *i. e.,* His own Flesh and Blood to be eaten and drunk in Holy Communion. The first of these

18 John VI, 31, 32, 49. 59.
16 John VI, 27, 52.
14 John VI, 32, 33.

foods was given in the past by Moses, the second is given at the present time by the Father, the third will be given in the future by the Son. Cfr. John VI, 32: "Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven."[10] John VI, 52: ". . . the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world."[17] The distinction is clear-cut and unmistakable. The "Bread from Heaven" is Christ Himself, given to the Jews as an object of faith through the Incarnation. The "Bread of Life" promised by Christ is a new food, to be dispensed at some future time, and to be eaten, not metaphorically but literally, in Holy Communion. Had our Lord not meant to speak in the literal sense, why this emphatic distinction between eating and drinking, food and drink, flesh and blood,[18] and why should He have repeatedly employed as a synonym of *φαγεῖν, "to* eat,"[20] the much more graphic term *τρώγαν,* which means literally "to crunch with the teeth"?

If we take the manna of the desert, which our Lord repeatedly mentions in His discourse, as a type of the Eucharist, we can argue as follows: Assuming that the Eucharist contained merely consecrated bread and wine, instead of the true Body and Blood of Christ, the original would not excel the type by which it was prefigured.[11] But St. Paul teaches that the original must transcend its type in the same way in which a body excels its shadow, and consequently the Eucharist contains more than mere

[10] John VI, 32: *"Non Moyses dedit (δίδωκεν) vobis panem de coelo, sed Pater meus dat (δίδωσιν) vobis panem de coelo verum."*

[17] John VI, 52: *"Et panis quem ego dabo (ἐγὼ δώσω), earo mea esi pro mundi vita."*

[18] Cfr. John VI, 54 »qq.

[19] John VI, $4, 56, 58.

[20] John VI, J'· 5J·

[21] Cfr. Heb. X. 1; 1 Cor. X, 3 «W-

bread and wine, namely, the true Flesh and Blood of Christ, as the Lord Himself declared.[12] Other types of the Holy Eucharist, according to the teaching of the Fathers, are: the bread and wine offered by Melchisedech,[12] the loaves of proposition,[2*] the blood of the covenant,[11] and the paschal lamb.[1"]

b) The words "Eat my flesh and drink my blood" must be understood literally for the further reason that a figurative interpretation is impossible. True, the phrase "to eat one's flesh" was employed metaphorically among the Semites and in Holy Scripture itself, but only in the sense of "to persecute, to hate bitterly," which cannot possibly be meant here. For had our Lord intended His words to be taken in this sense, it would appear that Fie had promised His enemies eternal life and a glorious resurrection in recompense for the injuries and persecutions directed against Him. The phrase, "to drink one's blood," has no other figurative meaning in Holy Scripture than that of dire chastisement,[2'] which is as inapplicable here as in the phrase "to eat one's flesh." Hence the declaration: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life,"[28] must be understood of the actual partaking of Christ in person, ». *e.* literally.

22 Bellannine, *De Eucharistia,* I, 2» Gen. XIV, 18; cfr. Ps. CIX, 4.
24 Ex. XXV, 30; 1 Kings XXI, 6 sqq.
«Ex. XXIV, 8; Heb. IX, ,7 8qq.
«Ex. XII, ,
2TCfr. Is. XLIX, 26; Apoc. XVI,
2« John VI, 55: *" Qui ma„j„cal*

It is objected that the expression "to eat one" in the sense of loving him beyond measure was as familiar to the Jews as it is to some modern nations. Those who make this assertion cite Job XXXI, 31: *"Dixerunt viri tabernaculi mei: Quis det de carnibus eius, ut saturemur?"* which our English Bible translates: "If the men of my tabernacle have not said: Who will give us of his flesh, that we may all be filled?" However, competent exegetes interpret this text either of the hatred Job felt for his enemies or of the hospitality he practiced towards his friends.[20] The first-mentioned interpretation confirms the contention that the phrase "to eat one," if used figuratively by the Hebrews, was always used in an odious sense; the latter does not disprove it. If certain of the Fathers interpret this obscure passage as expressing intense love, it was because they regarded Job as a type of Christ, and consequently attached a typical and prophetic sense to the text.

Such other texts as Prov. IX, 5: "Come, eat my bread, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you,"[30] and Ecclus. XXIV, 29: "They that eat me shall yet hunger, and they that drink me shall yet thirst,"[31] are too plainly figurative as to admit of misunderstanding. What else could the Divine Wisdom, which is here personified, mean by inviting men to "eat my bread" and to "eat me," than to nourish their souls with supernatural doctrine? The case is radically different in the Gospel of St. John, where the living God-man invites and commands men to eat His flesh and drink His blood. Here the phrase must be taken literally, since

meam carnem cl bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam."

20 Cfr. Knabcnbauer, *Comment. i» Librum Job,* Paris 1886.

so Prov. IX, 5: *"Penite, comedite panem meum ei bibite tinum, quod miscui vobis."*

31 Ecclus. XXIV, *sq: "Qui edunt me, adhuc esunent, ei qui bibunt me, adhuc sitient."*

the only possible figurative interpretation would entail absurd consequences.

c) The literal interpretation of our Lord's discourse agrees perfectly with the conduct of those who heard Him, and with the way in which He met their doubts and objections.

a) The murmuring of the Jews and their query: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" [32] is clear evidence that they had understood Him literally. Yet, far from repudiating this construction of His words, Jesus repeated them in a most solemn manner, saying: "Amen, amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up in the last day."[38] And as if to prevent a figurative interpretation of His words, He continued: "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." [34] The Evangelist tells us that many of His disciples were scandalized and protested: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" But instead of retracting what He had said, Christ reproached them for their want of faith and demanded that they believe Him, by alluding to His divine origin and His future ascension into Heaven. St. John tells us: "But Jesus, knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said to them: Does this scandalize you? If then you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was

Ï2 John VI. 53.

S3 John VI. 54 sq.: "4men, *amen dico vobis: Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis et* biberitis *eius* sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Qui manducat meam carnem el bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam, et ego *resuscilabo* eum in novissimo *dic."*

s* John VI. 56: *" Caro enim mea* vere (ἀXηOώἳ) est cibus, et sanguis meus vere (ἀXηβώἳ) est potus "

before? It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not."[35] He could have cleared up the misunderstanding, had there been one, with a single word, as He had often done before,[80] but He allowed them to depart without further ado,[87] and finally turned to the twelve Apostles with the question: "Will you also go away?"[38] Then Peter stepped forth and humbly and believingly replied in the name of his colleagues: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God."[30] Thus the number of His faithful disciples diminished, yet rather than recall His words or gloss over the literal sense in which they had been understood, our Lord would have allowed even the twelve Apostles to go away.

β) The Zwinglian and Anglican interpretation of the passage "It is the spirit that quickeneth," etc., in the sense of a glossing over, is wholly inadmissible. For in the first place such a glossing over would have practically amounted to a formal retractation of His teaching, because the expressions "to eat one's flesh" and "drink one's blood" cannot consistently be explained as "believing in him." Why should our Lord have uttered nonsense, only to recall His utterance afterwards? Clearly the Apostles and disciples did not understand the passage as a retraction, for in spite of it the disciples severed their connection with Jesus, while the Twelve accepted with simple faith a mystery which they did not as yet under-

33 John VI, 62 sqq.
30Cfr. John III, 3: IV, 3a; *aS Ibid.*
87 John VI, 68.

stand. Nor did Christ say, as the Zwinglians would have it: "My flesh is spirit," *i. e.,* to be understood in a figurative sense, but He said: "My words are spirit and life."

But what did our Lord mean when He added: "It is the spirit that quickencth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life"?[40]

There are two views regarding the interpretation of this text. Many of the Fathers declare that the true flesh of Jesus *(caro, σαρξ)* must not be understood as separated from His Divinity *(spiritus, πνεύμα),* and hence not in a cannibalistic sense but as belonging entirely to the supernatural economy.[41] The second and more scientific explanation[42] asserts that in the Scriptural opposition of "flesh" to "spirit" the former always signifies carnal-mindedness, the latter, mental perception illuminated by faith, and that it was the intention of Jesus in this passage to give prominence to the fact that the sublime mystery of the Eucharist can be grasped only in the light of supernatural faith, whereas it must remain unintelligible to the carnal-minded, who are weighed down under the burden of sin. St. Chrysostom explains: "How, therefore, did He say: The flesh profiteth nothing? Not of His flesh does He mean this; far from it; but of those who would understand what He had said in a carnal sense. . . . You see, there is question not of His flesh, but of the fleshly way of hearing."[43]

40 John VI, 64: "Spiritus est qui vivificet, coro non prodest quidqnom; verba quae ego locutui juin vobis, spiritus el vita sunt."

41 Thus St. Augustine, Trad, in Joo., 27, n. $: "*Non* prodest quidquoin, *sed* quomodo illi intellexerunt; *carnon* quippe lie intellexerunt, quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur «ut in macello venditur, non *quomodo* spiritu vegetatur. . . . *Spiritus* ergo est qui vivificat, *caro autem* no» *Prodest* quidquam; sicut *illi intel*m7n7"' T",m· C£o do "d manducandum carnem meam *'

'—On

d) The concurrent testimony of the Fathers and councils constitutes another strong argument for the literal interpretation of our Lord's discourse. While the figurative explanation preferred by a few Catholic theologians need not be "suspected of heresy," [44] Maldonatus is undoubtedly right in denouncing it as temerarious.

a) Maldonatus[45] has brought together a huge mass of citations to show that the Fathers are unanimous in interpreting John VI, 52 sqq. literally.[46] Even those who apply the first part of our Lord's discourse to the "*cibiis fidei,*" admit the literal interpretation as the only possible one for the second part. We have already quoted St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom. Augustine, though inclined to assign first place to the "spiritual eating of Christ in the faith,"[47] does not reject the literal, but uses it as a basis for the figurative interpretation.[48]

β) As regards the councils, that of Ephesus, of 431, approved St. Cyril's synodal letter to Nestorius, in which John VI, 55 is cited in support of the "life-giving virtue" of the hypostatically united Flesh of Christ in holy Com-

the different interpretations of John VI, 64, cfr. N. Cihr, *Die hl. Satramcnte der hath. Kirchc,* Vol. I, and ed., pp. 372 sqq.

44 Cfr. Alb. a Bulsano, *Theol. Dogma!.,* cd. Gottfr. a Graun, Vol. II. p. 597. Innsbruck 1894.

•ir. *Commentar, in loa.,* c. 6.

4· Cfr. also Vai. Schmidt, *Die Verheissung der Eucharistie bci den VHtern,* Wurzburg 1900; De Augustinis, *De Re Sacramentaria,* Vol. I, 2nd ed., pp. 460 sqq.

47 Cfr. *Tract,* in *loa.,* a$, n. la: *" Ut quid paras dentem et ventrem' Crede, el manducasti."*

48 Cfr. *Tract, in loa., 36.* n. 18: *" Qui non mane! in Christo et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manduca! spiritualiter carnem eius nec bibit eius sanguinem, licet camaliter et visibiliter Premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi; sed magis tantae rei sacramentum ad indicium sibi manducat et bibit, quia immundus praesumpsit ad Christi accedere sacramenta, quae aliquis non digne sumit, nisi qui mundus*

munion.*' The Second Ecumenical Council of Nicæa (787) condemned the contention of the Iconoclasts that the Eucharist is " the true, adorable image of Christ,"'00 cited John VI, 54, and concluded as follows: " Therefore it is clearly proved that neither our Lord, nor the Apostles, nor the Fathers ever referred to the unbloody sacrifice that is offered up by the priest as an image, but (called it] the very Body and the very Blood." 61 Those Catholic theologians who preferred the figurative interpretation52 were led to do so by controversial reasons. In their perplexity they imagined that the claims of the Hussites and Protestant Utraquists for the partaking of the chalice by the laity could not in any other way be effectively controverted from Scripture. In view of this circumstance the Tridentine Council refrained from a formal definition on the subject,53 though its own attitude is quite plain from the fact that it embodied several passages from the sixth chapter of St. John in its argument for the sacramental reception of the Eucharist in holy Communion.54

4# Cfr. Hardouin, *Coll. Concil.,* Vol. I, p. 1290.

50 την αληθή τοὐ Χριστοὐ «Ικὸρα-

61 Cfr. Hardouin, *op. cit.,* Vol. IV, 370: *"Ergo liquido demonstratum est, quod* nusquam *Dominus vel Apostoli vel Patres sacrificium incruentum per sacerdotem oblatum dixerunt imaginem, sed ipsum corpus et* ipjum iaiiguiitem."

62 Notably Nicholas of Cusa, Cardinal Cajetan, Ruardus Tapper, John Kessel, and the elder Jansenlus.

63 Cfr. Sess. XXI, cap. i: *". . . utcumque [sermo Christi} iuxta varias ss. Patrum et Doctorum interpretationes intclligatur."*

64 Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XIII, cap. 2; Sess. XXI, cap. i.— On the debates that took place on this subject at Trent, cfr. Pallavicini, *Hist. Cone. Trid.,* XVII, tr. A valuable work is Fr. Patrizi, S. J., *Commentationes Tres de Scripturis Divinis, de Peccati Originalis Propagatione a Paulo Descripta, de Christo Pane Vitae,* Rome 1851.

ARTICLE 2

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION

The Biblical argument for the Real Presence attains its climax in the words of institution, which have come down to us in four different versions. Two of these may be grouped as "Petrine," because they are obviously derived from St. Peter, while the other two, handed down by St. Paul and his companion St. Luke, may just as appropriately be called "Pauline."

The "Petrine" account, it will be noticed, is the simpler of the two, whereas the "Pauline" is more detailed, and, because of its wording, of greater importance for the doctrine of the Mass.1

THE PETRINE ACCOUNT	THE PAULINE ACCOUNT
Matth. XXVI, 26 sqq.: *Hoc est enim corpus meum. Τούτο ίστι το σϋμά μου.*	Luke XXII, 19 sqq.: *Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur: hoc facite in meam commemorationem. Τούτο ίστι το σώμά μου το inrep υμών δiδôρενον· τούτο iroitÎTt ek την ίμην άνάμνησιν.*
Hic est enim sanguis meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.	*Hic est calix Novum Testamentum in sanguine ineo, qui pro vobis fundetur. Τούτο το ποτηριον ‹)*

1 P. *infra.* Part HI.

Τούτο *γαρ ίση το* αιμά *μου το τή καινή διαθήκη το nf.pi* πολλών ά'χΐΠ'ό/ΐϊΐ'οΐ' «ί ἀψεσιν αμαρτιών.

καινή διαθήκη ίν τώ αΐματί μου, το υπίρ υμών ίκχυννόμίνον.

Mark XIV, 22 sqq.: *Hoc est corpus meum.* Γούτο ίστι το *σώμα μου.*

i Cor. XI, 24 sq.: *Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur: hoc facite in meam commemorationem.* Τούτο *μου ίστι το σώμα* το *νπίρ υμών* [κλώμενον]· τούτο ποιείτε ει *την ίμήν άνάμνησιν.*

Hic est sanguis meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur. Τούτο ΐστι το αιμά μου τή καινή διαθήκη, το ὕπιρ πολλών εκχυπάμενον.

Hic calix Novum Testamentum est in meo sanguine: hoc facite, quotiescumque bibetis, in meam commemorationem. *Ύοΰτο* το *ποτήριον ή καινή διαθηκη* εστιν εν *τώ ίμώ αΐματι· τούτο* ποιείτε, οσάκι αν *κινητέ,* ει τήν *έμήν άνάμνησιν.*

The decisive words of all these passages are: "This is my body, this is my blood." The Catholic Church has always interpreted them in the strictly literal sense. The first to explain them figuratively was Berengarius, who was followed by a few other heretics of comparatively modern date?

The figurative interpretation is inadmissible.

ïCfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Sets. XIII. cap. a OJenzinser-Baniwart, n. 874)

This can be shown by proving (1) that the literal explanation is the only correct one, and (2) that the heretical objections raised against it are groundless.

I. The Literal Interpretation of the Words of Institution Shown to Be the Only Correct One.—The words of institution are so plain that they require no interpretation.

If an ordinary man were to break bread and say: "Eat, this is my body," no one would take him seriously; still it would be impossible to explain his words in a figurative sense. Belief in the Real Presence presupposes belief in the Divinity of Christ.[3]

We are compelled to adopt the literal interpretation of the words of institution, (a) by the very existence and character of the four Evangelical accounts quoted above; (b) by the wording of the Scriptural text, and (c) by the circumstances accompanying the institution.

a) The very existence of four different accounts, all couched in simple language and perfectly consonant with one another in every essential detail, compels us to interpret them literally.

a) When four independent authors, writing in different countries and at different times, relate the words of institution to different circles of readers, the occurrence of an unusual figure of speech would somehow or other betray itself, either in a difference of word-setting (as is the case with regard to the chalice), or in the unequivocal

3 Cfr. J. Helm, *Ute Emsetsung des hl. Abendmahles els Bcweis /Sr die Cotiheit Christi,* Wurzburg 1900.

expression of the meaning really intended, or at least in the addition of some such remark as: "He spoke, however, of the sign of His body." Such explanatory remarks frequently occur in Sacred Scripture, even in less important texts (cfr. John II, 19 sqq.; III, 3 sqq.; IV, 32 sqq.; Matth. XVI, 6 sqq., XVII, 12 sq.) and where several writers supplement one another (cf. *cf.,* John XII, 4 sq.; cfr. Matth. XXVI, 8; Luke XXIII, 39; Matth. XXVII, 44). In the present case, however, we nowhere discover the slightest ground for a figurative interpretation of the words "my body," "my blood." If, then, the literal interpretation were false, the Scriptural record would have to be considered as the cause of a pernicious error in faith and of the grievous crime of rendering idolatrous homage to mere bread *(artolatria')*,— a supposition utterly irreconcilable with the character of the four sacred writers or with the inspiration of the text.

β) This view is confirmed by the important circumstance that one of the four narrators, St. Paul, has himself interpreted his account literally.

In his First Epistle to the Corinthians the Apostle says the unworthy recipient of the Eucharist is "guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord." Cfr. 1 Cor. XI, 27 sqq.: "Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and of the Blood of the Lord. . . . For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord."[4] There could be no question of a grievous offense against Christ Himself if His true Body and

4 i Cor. XI. 27 sqq.'· "Haque fanem JlMnc ...
(ware) ewicHnque manducaverit Domini indigne λ *calicem*

Blood were not really present in the Eucharist. Surely St. Paul would not have spoken thus of the manna or the paschal lamb!

b) The laws of human speech as well as the appositional phrases used by the sacred writers in connection with the terms "body" and "blood," directly exclude the possibility of a figurative interpretation.[5]

a) The necessity of adopting the natural and literal sense of the words of institution is not, as our opponents allege, based upon the assumption that Christ could not have resorted to the use of figures of speech in inculcating His doctrine, but upon the evident requirements of the case, which demand that He should not, in a matter of such paramount importance, have recourse to meaningless and deceptive metaphors.

Figures enhance the clearness of speech only when the figurative meaning is obvious, either from the nature of the case *(e. g.,* from a reference to a statue of Lincoln, by saying, "This is Lincoln"), or from the usages of common parlance (as in the case of the synecdoche: "This chalice is my blood"), or at least from some previous agreement (as: "Let us assume that these two sticks represent Plato and Aristotle"). Now, neither from the nature of the case nor in common parlance is bread an apt or a possible symbol of the human body.

corporis et sanguinis Domini. . . . Qui enim manducat ci bibit indigne, indicium (κρίμα) sibi manducat et bibit: non diiudicans (μη διακρίνωμ) corpus Domini."

[5] *I". No.* a. *infra,* pp. ja sqq.

Were one to say of a piece of bread: "This is the body of Cæsar," he would not be using a figure but simply utter nonsense. There is but one means of rendering a symbol, improperly so called, clear and intelligible, namely, by conventionally settling beforehand what it is to signify, as, for instance, if one were to say: "Let us imagine these two pencils to be Plato and Socrates." Christ, however, instead of informing His Apostles that He intended to use such a figure, told them rather the contrary in the discourse containing the promise: "The bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world."[6] The same applies, *servata proportione,* to wine as the symbol of human blood. To say, therefore, that Christ, by using the words "This is my Body, this is my Blood," merely meant to institute an image or a symbol of His Body and Blood, is not to say that He spoke figuratively, but to charge Him with talking nonsense,—a blasphemous charge. The natural sense of the words of institution is so clear and compelling that even Luther wrote to his followers in Strassburg, in 1524: "I am caught, I cannot escape, the text is too strong."[7] When the God-man declares: "This is my Body," who but an unbeliever would venture to contradict Him by saying; "No, it is mere bread."

β) The literal interpretation of the words of institution is fairly forced upon us by the significant appositional phrases used by the sacred writers in connection with the terms *"corpus"* and *"sanguis."*

[6] John VI, 52. See Art. I, 1 *Allud* De Welle, II, 577: "*Abtr* icl< Mn gefongen, konn niclil

Zj win - ■ eewa,"e
aus demS'v·' *lassen*
our dem S,nn reiMC,,."

"Almost every syllable of the original Greek," as Clarke points out, "especially the articles, is singularly emphatic." [e] The use of the definite article, and its frequent repetition, proves that our Lord desired to employ every safeguard to prevent His words from being interpreted metaphorically. If an autograph collector were to tell me: "Here I have a codex of St. Thomas, to which he devoted much care," I should quite naturally understand him to mean a holographic original, not a mere copy. Moreover, Christ speaks of His Body as "given for you" *(το υπέρ υμών διδόμενον)* and of His Blood as "shed for you (το *υπέρ υμών εκχυννόμενον)* for the forgiveness of sins." Hence the Body given to the Apostles was the same Body that was crucified on the cross, and the Chalice contained the same Blood that was shed for our sins.

c) We arrive at the same conclusion if we consider the circumstances accompanying the institution of the Eucharist. Those who heard our Saviour's words were simple uneducated fishermen, whereas He was the omniscient God, who had a particular reason for speaking plainly on this occasion, because He was communicating His last will and testament.

a) The Apostles were not possessed of the learned equipment that would have enabled them to unravel a dark and mysterious phraseology. They were ignorant men, from the ranks of the people, who hung upon the words of their Master with childlike simplicity and unquestioningly accepted whatever He told them. This

e .-*Ipud* Wiseman, *The Real Pretence,* p. *267.*

childlike disposition had to be reckoned with by Christ. Can we assume that, after they had been prepared for the literal promise of the Eucharist, they should have understood that promise, when it actually came to be made, in a sense which would have involved them in the most absurd misunderstandings and contradictions? Our Lord, when He pronounced the words of institution, was on the eve of His passion and death. It was His last will and testament He was giving them, and He spoke as a dying father to His sorrowing children.0 In such a solemn moment the only appropriate mode of speech was one which, stripped of tropes and figures, made use of the simplest words corresponding exactly to the meaning to be conveyed.

β) It should be remembered also that Christ, being God, must have foreseen the tragic error into which He would have led His Apostles and His Church by giving them as His real Body and Blood something which was merely bread and wine. The Church has always based her Eucharistic teaching and practice on the words of her Divine Founder. If she were in error and the adoration she shows to the Holy Eucharist were idolatry, the mistake would have to be laid at the door of our Lord Himself. Yet we are told that the interpretation of His words which the Church held from the beginning, was false, and that it required over a thousand years for the real meaning to be discovered by Bercngarius (4-1088) and John Calvin. Are we to assume that heretics and infidels understood our Lord correctly, while the Church, who has the promise of His permanent assistance, was and is egregiously in error?

To this apologetical argument may be added two others of a more dogmatic character.

0C(r. John XUI, i; XV, i5.

PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE

(1) The Holy Eucharist is the last will and testament of our Lord.

As is plain from the words of consecration, Christ established the "New Testament" *(Novum Testamentum, ') καινή 3ιαθηκη)* in His Blood. Surely, no sane man would employ unintelligible tropes and figures in drawing up his last will and testament. Jehovah spoke unequivocally when He established the Ancient Covenant: "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you."[10] How clearly did not Jacob,[11] David,[12] Tobias,[13] and Mathathias[14] formulate their last will and testament! Are we to assume that Jesus Christ, the God-man, was careless in this important matter? With a true instinct the Roman law prescribes[15] that the words of a will must be taken in their natural and literal sense. It would be ridiculous to interpret the term "house" in the will of a testator, not of a real edifice, but of a painting. Christ, according to the literal purport of His testament, has left us His Body and Blood as a precious legacy; are we justified in interpreting this as a mere symbol?

(2) The Holy Eucharist is a Sacrament. It was the will of Christ that it should be solemnly celebrated as such in His Church to the end of time. The Sacraments of the Old Law, which are so far inferior to those of the New, were established in unequivocal terms, and there never was any dispute about their meaning.[18] Is it possible to assume that Christ used less care in instituting the Sacraments of the New Covenant? What would become of Baptism if it were permissible to interpret the term

10 Ex. XXIV, 8; cfr. Heb. IX, 19 sqq.
11 Gen. XLIX, 29 sqq.
12 *3* Kings II, 2 sqq.
is Tob. IV, *3* sqq.
14 i Mach. II, 49 sqq.
is Cfr. *Cod. Rom.* ff. Z?« *Lttat.*.
ie Cfr. rohle-Preus*. *The Satva·menti,* Vol. I., pp. sqq.

"water" in a figurative sense? The Eucharist is no exception to this rule. A figurative interpretation of the terms " Body " and " Blood " would contradict the plain meaning of the words of institution. Rationalists have tried to disprove this argument by saying that a Sacrament is by its very concept a sign or symbol of something else. This is undeniable. But the Apostles could not possibly know beforehand that Christ, when He pronounced the words of institution, wished to establish a new Sacrament; they had to conclude it from His words and actions.[17] It was only from His plain and unmistakable utterance that they learned that He had raised, not bread and wine as a mere symbol of His Body and Blood, but His very Body and Blood under the sacramental signs of bread and wine, to the rank of a Sacrament.[18]

2. Objections to the Literal Interpretation of the Words of Institution Answered. —The defenders of the figurative interpretation are very much at variance among themselves and regard the words of institution as a veritable enigma.

Luther ridiculed the so-called Sacramentarians in his treatise *Wider die Schivarmgeister,* published at Nuremberg in 1527. " Carlstadt," he said, " in the sacred text 'This is my body,' tortures the little word *this;* Zwingli tortures the little word *is;* Oecolampadius tortures the little word body. . . . Thus doth the devil brutally fool

17 Cfr. Hcinrich-Gutberlet, Dogmaliiche *Théologie,* Vol. MC, p. 490, Mayence 1901.

18 For a fuller treatment of this topic consult Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* 1, 9; N. Gihri Die hl Sakromenu <jcr *kath. Kirche,* Vol I, 2nd cd.. 8 ' u'.

us." There were no limits to the Eucharistic disputes in the sixteenth century. As early as 1577, Christopher Rasperger wrestled with two hundred different interpretations of the words of institution.[10] This confusion was an inevitable consequence of the rejection of the true literal sense of our Lord's words. Error is a many-headed hydra, the truth alone is one. Cardinal Bellarmine, in his treatise *De Eucharistia,*[20] reduced all those different interpretations to ten groups, four of which regard the word *hoc,* two the word *est,* three the word *corpus,* and one the word *meum.*[21] Setting aside the more violent distortions of the literal sense, we will confine ourselves to a brief review of the three principal groups.[22]

a) The first group of Sacramentarians, headed by Zwingli, sees a figure in the copula *est* and renders the passage: "This signifies *(est = significat)* my Body."

Many Scriptural texts have been quoted in support of this interpretation. Here are a few chosen at random. Gen. XLI, *26:* " The seven beautiful kine . . . are seven years of plenty." Dan. VII, 17: "These four great beasts are four kingdoms . . ." Matth. XIII, 38: " The field is the world; and the good seed are the children of the kingdom; and the cockle are the children of the wicked one." Gal. IV, 24: "For these [Sara and /\gar] are the two testaments." Apoc. 1,20: "The seven candlesticks are the seven churches."

10 Chr. Rasperger, *Ducentae Verborum: 'Hoc est corpus meum, etc.' Interpretationes,* Ingolstadt *1577.*

20 *De Eucli·,* I, 8.

21 This last-mentioned interpretation. suggested by Luther, was not meant seriously.

22 On the confusion created by the figurative interpretation of the words of institution, cfr. Luthardt (Lutheran), */Compendium der Dogmalik,* pp. jjj sqq., Leipzig *1900.*

A favorite text of this school of interpreters is 1 Cor. X, 4: "And all drank the same spiritual drink; (and they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was [i. *e.* symbolized] Christ)." This interpretation is still upheld by some Rationalists. Thus Schmiedel says that "ἐστί indubitably means to *signify;*" Henrici declares that it "expresses the relation of identity in a metaphorical connexion;" Weiss, that it is "the copula in a symbolic relation."

Refutation of This Theory.—The Rationalist interpretation just explained is contrary to the principles of logic.

Most logicians deny that the verb "to be" (εἶναι, *esse)* can ever be used in the metaphorical sense of "to signify" or "to represent." But even waiving this question, it is a fundamental truth of the science of correct reasoning that propositions generally are divided into two classes: those that denominate a thing as it is in itself *{e. g.,* "Man is a rational being"), and those that designate an object as a sign of something else (e. *g.,* "This picture is my father"). There are three criteria for ascertaining whether a speaker intends a proposition to be taken in the latter sense: (a) the figurative meaning may be obvious from the nature of the subject *{ex subiectâ materia)* or from common usage *{ex usu linguae),* as explained above; (b) when one complete substance is predicated of another complete substance, there can be no logical relation of identity between the two, but only of similarity, that is to say, the one is an image, sign, or symbol of the other; (c) if there has been a previous agreement between speaker and hearer, author and reader, objects in themselves inappropriate to serve the purpose, may be used as

signs of other objects. Where none of these criteria applies, we must follow the common-sense rule and interpret literally.

Arc any of these criteria applicable to the words by which Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist?

Not the first, for neither in the nature of the case nor from the usages of common parlance can bread be a symbol of the human body or wine a symbol of human blood.

Not the second, for Christ did not predicate one complete substance of another complete substance. He did not say: "This bread is my body," but indefinitely: "This *(τοϋτο,* not *ουτο , scil. ô ἀρτο)* is my body."

Not the third criterion, because there was no previous agreement as to an arbitrary symbolism, but rather the contrary.[23] The Scriptural texts brought forward by Zwingli and his followers are not even grammatically exact parallels to the words of institution; for all of them have for their subject a substantive noun, whereas in the words of institution the subject is a demonstrative adverb —"*hoc.*" The pronoun *haec (αυτοί)* in Gal. IV, 24, refers so plainly to the two persons previously mentioned (Sara and Agar) that St. Paul's explanatory remark, "These things are said by an allegory," really seems superfluous.

The only text that would appear to offer any serious difficulty is i Cor. X, 4: *"Petra autem erat Christus* — And the rock was [signified] Christ." Is this meant as a parallel to the words of institution? If the subject "rock" be taken in its material sense, the metaphor is quite apparent, and would be unmistakable even if the Apostle had not added: "*Now* these things were done

23 K *su/>ra,* pp. a? eq.

in a figure of us."[21] But sundry theologians[25]* prefer to take the word "rock" in an allegorical sense, because the Apostle, a little farther up, speaks of Christ as "the spiritual rock"[20] which invisibly accompanied the Israelites on their journeys and supplied them with a spiritual fountain of water. According to this explanation Christ did not merely *signify,* but *was,* the spiritual rock, and hence the copula retains its proper meaning, "to be."[27]

In certain Anglican circles it was formerly the custom to appeal to the supposed poverty of the Aramaic tongue, which was spoken by Christ in conversing with His Apostles. It was maintained that this language had no word corresponding to the concept "signify." Yet, even prescinding from the fact that in Aramaic the copula *est* is usually omitted, and that such an omission rather argues for its strict meaning "to be," Cardinal Wiseman succeeded in producing no less than forty Syriac expressions conveying the meaning of "to signify," and thus effectually exploded the myth of the limited vocabulary of the Semitic tongue.[28]

The Syrian Bishop Maruthas, a contemporary and friend of St. John Chrysostom, refuted the Zwinglians in advance as it were when he wrote: "For Christ called this [i. *e.* His Body] not a type or figure, but [He said]: This is truly my Body and my Blood."[20]

It should be noted that the question here at issue must be decided not by the unknown Aramaic text of our

21 i Cor. X, 6: *"Haec autem in figura facio sunt nostri."*

2t- Notably FranzcVtn (De *Eucharistia,* p. 63).

20 « Cor. X, 4: "Bibebant autem *de spiritali, consequente eoi, petra; petra* autem erat Christus."

27 Cfr. ΛI. Schafer, Erkliirung *der bcidcn Briefc* an *die Korinthcr,* pp. 187 sqq., Munster 1903; McRory, *The Epiitles of St. Paul t0 the* Cormthians, pp. ,36 sqq , DubIin

Lord's discourse (which W. Berning has hypothetically reconstructed), but by the Greek text, which everywhere has *tari* and not *σημαίνα.*™

b) A second group of Sacramentarians, following the lead of Oecolampadius, shifted the diligently sought-for metaphor to the concept contained in the predicate *corpus,* giving to the latter the sense of *"signum corporis,"* so that the words of institution would have to be rendered: "This is a sign [symbol, image, type] of my Body."

This absurd theory essentially coincides with the Zwinglian interpretation. Its latest exponent, Durand,[3]* tries to show that the Christian Church has always understood the words of institution as meaning: ''This [bread] is the symbol of my Body."

Refutation of This Theory.—This contention is disproved by the fact that in all languages the expression "body" designates a person's natural body, not a mere sign or symbol of that body.

True it is that the Scriptural words " Body of Christ " are sometimes figuratively used in the meaning of " Church " *(corpus Christi mysticum),* but this figure is always easily discernible as such from the text or context. Cfr. Col. I, 24: " I make up in my flesh what is lacking to the sufferings of Christ on behalf of his body,

30 The Scriptural proof of the Real Presence is copiously developed by Card. Wiseman in his famous Lectures on *The Real Presence;* see also Cbr. Peach. *Praelect. Dogmat.,* Vo). VI, 3rd ed.. pp. 265 sqq.

SI *Dae Problem der Eocharutie and seine Losing,* Berlin 1898.

which is the church." This mystical sense, however, cannot be intended in the words of institution, for the simple reason that Christ did not give the Apostles His Church to eat, but His Body, which " Body," by reason of a real and logical association, cannot be separated from His " Blood," and hence is all the less susceptible of a figurative use. Since our Divine Saviour in all likelihood spoke Aramaic, it is probable that the words in their original form were *Hoc* [esf] *corpus meum"*

The Aramaic word (Hebrew has the secondary meaning of *substantia, realitas, persona.* Were we to take the term in this secondary sense in the above-quoted passage, we should get: "This [is] my substance or person," which would express the Real Presence even more clearly. But this interpretation is inadmissible for the simple reason that the parallel phrase " This is my blood" cannot be treated in the same way. The case would be different if the reading were: " This is the bread of my Body, the wine of my Blood."

Some heretics evolve the figurative sense from the relation of the pronoun *hoc* to the predicate *corpus meum,* saying: "That which is bread and remains bread, cannot be at the same time the true Body of Christ, but at most an image thereof." This altogether arbitrary construction is disproved by the text itself, which does not say: " This bread is (and remains) my Body," but indefinitely: Τοὐτό [not οὐτο ὁ ἀρτο] «στι το *σώμα* μου,[82] i. *e.,* that which I give you is my Body, and consequently no longer bread." Our interpretation is confirmed by St Luke, who says: " This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which [chalice] shall be shed for you "[38] In other words: the contents of the chalice is my Blood,

[82] Matth. XXVI, 26. [38] as Luke XXII, 20

which shall be shed for you. Consequently, what the Apostles received in the chalice was not wine, but really and truly the Blood of Christ.

To prove that the contents of the chalice were mere wine, Protestants have had recourse to the text of St. Matthew, where it is related that our Lord, after the completion of the Last Supper, declared: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine."[34] St. Luke, who is chronologically more exact, places these words before the institution of the Eucharist.[30] Note, also, that the true Blood of Christ may rightly still be called (consecrated) wine, because the Blood is partaken of after the manner in which wine is drunk, and also because it continues to exist under the outward appearance of wine. For this reason St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, calls the Body of Christ "bread"—emphatically: *τον ἀρτον τούτον,* "this (peculiar) bread"[30]—because the Body of Christ is eaten like bread[37] and retains the outward appearance of bread after the consecration.

c) There are certain Scriptural texts which are believed to be so near an approach to a parallel with the words of institution that they have been termed sacramental expressions *(locutiones sacramentales').*

The two principal texts of this kind are Gen. XVII, to: *"Hoc* [t. *e. circumcisio] est pactum meum [= signum pacti mei],"* and Ex. XII, it: *"[Agnus paschalis] esi enim phase [». e. transitus] Domini."* It was chiefly by a clever manipulation of the latter that Zwingli succeeded

3« Matth. XXVI, »9: *"Non biboot amodo de hoc genimine vilit (τοὐ ^ινήματοί τήτ ἀμττίΧοιΟ."*

seCfr. Luke XXII, tS »qq.

30 i Cor. XI. *16.*

at Cfr. i Cor. X, «6.

in robbing the people of Zurich of their Catholic faith.[88]

Refutation of This Theory.—From the exegetical point of view the texts just quoted can hardly be regarded as parallels to the words of institution; to call them "sacramental expressions" is foolish.

No parallelism can be discerned between the phrases employed by those Old Testament writers and the words of institution: no *real* parallelism, because there is question of entirely different things; no *verbal* parallelism, since in both Gen. XVII, 10 and Ex. XII, 11 the subject is a ceremony (circumcision in the first, the rite of the paschal lamb in the second), while the predicate involves a mere abstraction (Covenant, Passover of the Lord).

A much weightier consideration is this, that on closer investigation the copula *est* will be found to retain its proper meaning of "is" rather than "signifies." Moses by divine command established the Covenant by sprinkling the Israelites with sacrificial blood, saying: "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you."[89] St. Paul, after quoting these words in his Epistle to the Hebrews, says that the New Covenant was established in a similar manner by the Blood of Christ,[40] and our Lord Himself expressly declares: "This is my blood of the New Testament."[41] Here we have both a verbal and a real parallelism between the two Testaments, which forces us to conclude: As the Old

38 On a third "sacramental expression" (1 Cor. X, 4: *"Petra erat Christus"*), see anpra, pp. 35 s<l.

39 Ex. XXIV, 8: *"Hic est sanguir foederis, quod pepigit Dominus* Tobucum." The Septuagint has:

41 Maith. XXVI, a8.

Testament was established by the blood of calves, so the New Testament was established by the sacrificial Blood of Jesus Christ

A closer analysis of the texts under consideration shows that the copula in every case retains its proper meaning and cannot be rendered by "signifies." The command regarding circumcision reads as follows in the original: *"Hoc est pactum meitm . . circumcidi vobis· omnem masculum,"*[42] that is to say, the rite of circumcision is the content or object of the divine command, not merely a sign or symbol thereof. This last-mentioned function is added later. Gen. XVII, II: "And you shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, that it may be for a sign of the covenant between me and you."

The second text cited by the Sacramentarians reads as follows: *"Sic autem comedetis illum* [i. *e. agnum]. Renes vestros accingetis, etc. . . . Est enim phase* [i. *e. transitus] Domini."*[43] This means that the entire rite thus described, and not merely the paschal lamb, *is* (not *signifies)* the Feast of the Passover.[44]

3. Incidental Problems.—For a better understanding of the words of institution it is well to examine two incidental problems, *vis.:*

42 Gen. XVII, io.

43 Ex. XII, 11.

44 Cfr. W. Koch, *Die neutestamcntliehen Abendmahlsberichte und die neueste Abendmahlforschung,* in the *Thecl. Quartalschrift.* of Tubingen. t9°5. PP- 23° «IQ.; G. Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Bussakramcnt in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche.* 2nd ed., pp. 38 sqq., Freiburg 19:0 (English tr., *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church.* St. Louis 1913); A. Ebrard. *Das Dogma com hl. Abendmahl und seine Geschiehte, 3* vols.. Frankfort on the Main 184$-*: J. Hoffmann, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum.* Berlin 1903; R- Seeberg, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament,* Berlin 1905. (The last three authors are Protestants.)

(a) Are the words of institution to be regarded as a theoretical or as a practical proposition? and

(b) What is the meaning of the pronoun *hoc?*

a) A theoretical proposition merely affirms, whereas a practical proposition effects the identity of subject and predicate. "This is water," *e. g.,* is a theoretical proposition. "You are a lieutenant," if pronounced by a general in promoting a soldier, is a practical proposition. It was obviously such a practical proposition that Christ enunciated when He said, "This is my body;" for what was merely bread when He began to speak, had been changed into His sacred Body when He was through speaking. Thus the words of institution are at the same time words of consecration.

The question has been raised whether our Lord, without destroying the practical effect of His words, could have said: "This bread is my Body." Oswald thinks that "If Christ had said 'This bread is my Body,' the laws of logic would require that either the subject or the predicate be modified, *i. e.,* taken in a sense other than the natural sense," and adds: "Fortunately, Christ did not speak thus."[40]

It is quite true that had Christ employed the phrase mentioned, He would have made it difficult, nay impossible, for us to interpret His words literally, because, as we have seen, to predicate one complete substance of another complete substance means to speak figuratively.

The question may be put somewhat differently as follows: Could Christ have silently used the phrase·

46 *Die dogntatische Lehrevon den hl. Sakramcnten,* Vol. I, 5Ui eij p. 335·

"This bread is my body" in consecrating the sacred species? Franzelin[40]* thinks He could. He says that while the universal proposition "Bread (in general) is my body" would have no consecratory power, because no objective identity is conceivable between bread as such and the Body of Christ, the particular proposition "This bread is my body" is quite as susceptible of being endowed with such power as were the words of Aaron before Pharaoh, "These rods be serpents," or the Saviour's own silent command at Cana, "This water shall be (is) wine."

b) Assuming that the words of institution constitute a practical proposition, the Scholastics raised the interesting logical problem: What does the pronoun *hoc* "suppose,"[47] *i. e.,* for what precisely does it stand?

The majority of Catholic theologians hold with St. Thomas[48] that *hoc* stands for "substance in general" *(substantia in communi),* without quality, that is, without a determinate form. St. Bonaventure says[49] that it stands for "the bread in course of conversion into the Body of Christ," the *terminus a quo* of consecration. Scotus maintains that it stands for "the bread already consecrated," *i. e.* the Body of Christ, which is the *terminus ad quern* of consecration.[50] Franzelin[31] shows that these three opinions can easily be combined by distinguishing between the "signification" and the "demonstration" of the pronoun. *Hoc* invariably signifies a thing here and now present, without determining its

40 *De Eucharistia,* 4th cd., Rome 1887.

47 On the "supposition" *of* terms, see Pohle-Preuss, *Christology,* pp. 197 s<l·

48 Summa Theologica, 3a, qu. 78,

40 *Comment, in Sent., IV,* diet 8, p. 2, art. I, qu. >.

00 This view is enthusiastically defended by Maldonatus, *Comment, in Matth.*. 26, 26.

01 *De Eucharistia,* 4th ed., thes. 6, Rome 1887.

nature; but it "demonstrates" that thing only in the state in which it actually exists at the time the proposition is uttered. Applying this rule to the words of institution, we find that St. Thomas is right in saying that *hoc* can only signify "substance in general," without a determinate form; that St. Bonaventure is right in asserting that *hoc, at* the beginning of the sentence, "demonstrates" merely bread, and that Scotus contradicts neither the one nor the other of these eminent writers when he claims that *hoc,* considered at the end of the sentence, *i. e.* when the sentence is completed, "demonstrates" the Body of Christ.

Of less importance is the grammatical question whether the pronoun *hoc* in the words of institution must be taken substantively or adjectively. As all the predicates in the Greek text (σὠμα, *αἱμα, ποτηριον')* are of the neuter gender, this question cannot be definitively answered. *Corpus* in Latin being also neuter, while *sanguis* and *calix* are masculine, the Vulgate has translated τοϋτο adjectively. There is no essential difference between the two versions.

SECTION 2

PROOF FROM TRADITION

More conclusively perhaps than any other dogma of the Catholic faith can the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist be demonstrated from Tradition.

The Popes prove this sublime truth by clearly defining it against various heretics; the Fathers unanimously bear witness to it; the Church at large held it in uninterrupted possession from the Apostolic age down to the eleventh century.

ARTICLE i

HERETICAL ERRORS VS. THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH

It is a remarkable fact that, aside possibly from Docetism,[1] no heresy denying the Real Presence was ever able to take root in the primitive Church. When Berengarius of Tours attacked this dogma, in the eleventh century, the Church at once condemned the innovation and took determined means to suppress it. The widely divergent errors of the Protestant Reformers on this subject were vigorously rejected by the Council of Trent.

i. The Three Great Eucharistic Controversies.—Church history records three great

[1] Cfr. St. Ignatius, E/', *ad Smyrn.,* c. 7, i (cd. Funk, I, 341).

Eucharistic controversies. The first was begun by Paschasius Radbertus, in the ninth century;[2] the second, by Berengarius of Tours, in the eleventh; the third, by the Protestant Reformers.

a) The controversy of the ninth century left the dogmatic teaching of the Church intact and concerned itself solely with a philosophical question.

St. Paschasius Radbertus, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Corbie,[3] in a treatise *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini,* published in 831, affirmed the identity of the Eucharistic Body of Christ with the natural Body He had on earth and now has in Heaven. In defending this view it seems Radbertus neglected the true though only accidental distinction between the sacramental and the natural condition of our Saviour's Body. Hence Ratramnus, Rhabanus Maurus, and other contemporary theologians were justified in censuring the numerical identity asserted by Radbertus as a novel and unheard-of" doctrine, and insisting on the distinction just mentioned. The Body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, they declared, while identical with His natural Body *naturaliter seu secundum substantiam,* is not identical with it *specialiter seu secundum speciem (= statum).** In defending his position Paschasius was

2 This first controversy scarcely extended beyond the limits of a Scholastic altercation. Harnack *(Dogmengcschichte,* Vol. HI, 5th ed., pp. 278 sqq., Freiburg 1896) unduly exaggerates its importance.

8 Sec a sketch of his life in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. XI, p. 518. His treatise *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* can be found in Martcne, *Vet. Script, cl Monum. Ampl. Collectio,* t. IX, and in Migne, *P. L.,* CXX.

* Cfr. Rhabanus Maurus, *Ep.* 3 ad Egilcm (Migne, P. *L.,* CXII, 1513): *Manifestissime cognoscetis, non qu'.dem abtit — naturaliter,* «d sfeemhter aliud eJie Co

able to quote St. Chrysostom, who in teaching the Real Presence employed precisely the same language without ever having been suspected of theological inaccuracy. Neither St. Chrysostom nor St. Paschasius dreamed of asserting that the Body of Christ was nailed to the Cross in its sacramental state, *i. e.* in the form of a host, and Heriger, Ratherius, and other opponents of the Abbot of Corbie were plainly beating the air when they employed their learning to refute his alleged assertion that the sacramental species are identical with the Body of Christ. Lanfranc, writing in the eleventh century, effectively disposes of the matter thus: "It can truly be said that we receive the very Body which was taken from the Virgin, and yet not the same. It is the same in essence and property of true nature; but it is not the same if you regard the species of bread and wine."[5]

b) The first occasion for an official procedure on the part of the Church arose when Berengarius of Tours († 1088), influenced by the writings of Scotus Eriugena,[6] formally rejected both the doc-

Domini, quod ex substantia panis et vini fro mundi vita quotidie per Spiritum Sanctum consecratur . . . et aliud specialiter esse corpus Christi, quod natum est de Maria virgine, in quod illud transfertur."

5 *Adv. Berengar.,* c. 18: *"Vere posse dici et ipsum corpus, quod de Virgine sumptum est, nos sumere; et tamen non ipsum. Ipsum quidem quantum ad essentiam veraeque naturae proprietatem; non ipsum autem, si spectes panis vinique species." Cfr.* Bach, *Dogmengcschichte des Mittelallers,* Vol. I, pp. 156 sqq., Vienna 1873; J. Hergenrother, *Kirchcngeschichte,* Vol. II, 3rd ed.. pp. 163 sqq., Freiburg 1885. A thorough vindication of St. Paschasius was made by Gerbcrt, afterwards Pope Sylvester II († 1003), in a work bearing the same title. *De Corpore cl Sanguine Domini. Cfr. Ernst, Die Lehre des Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie.* Freiburg 1896; Choisy, *Puschase Radbert,* Geneva 1889.

6 Scotus Eriugena composed his treatise *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* about the year 860; the text has been lost and no authentic information has come down to us *re-*

trine of the Real Presence and that of Transubstantiation.[7]

In his treatise *De Sacra Coetia,* discovered by Lessing in I774and made public by Vischer in 1834, Berengarius expressly asserts: "If it is said, 'The bread which is placed upon the altar after the consecration is the body of Christ,' this is just as much a figure of speech as if it is said, 'Christ is a lion, a lamb, the main cornerstone.' "[8] This heretical teaching gave great scandal and was vigorously combatted by Durandus of Troarne, Guitmund, Lanfranc, Alger of Liège, and other learned theologians.[0]

c) The third and most momentous Eucharistic controversy was that opened by the Protestant Reformers in the first half of the sixteenth century. In the main there were three schools: the Lutheran, the Zwinglian, and the Calvinist.

a) Luther seems at first to have clung to the traditional Catholic doctrine, though it did not

Raiding it.—On John Scotus Eriugena ("Eriugena" means "a native of Ireland"), see W. Turner in the Catholic *Encyclopedia,* Vol, V, pp. 519 sqq.; Gardner, *Studies* in *John* the Scot, London 1900.

1 *V. infra,* Ch. III, Sect. 2.

8 "*Non* -minus *tropica oratione* dicitur: *Panis, qui* ponitur in altari, *post consecrationem est corpus* Christi, quam dicitur: Christus *est leo, agnus,* summus *lapis* angularis." — Berengarius certainly denied Transubslantiation. As to his teaching on the Real Presence, which is rather obscure, "there is much divergence of opinion among historians and theologians." Perhaps the difficulty for him was "in the mode rather than in the fact; . . . yet his exposition of [the Real Presence], together with his principles of philosophy, endanger the fact itself of the Real Presence and sound very much like a negative of it." (G. M. Sauvage in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. II, p. 488).

n Their writings are reproduced by Hurter in his *Sanctorum Patrum* Opuscula *Selecta,* Series I, vols 23 38. 39- Cfr. J. Schnitzer, *Bcrcngar* von Tours, 2nd ed., pp. 133 sqn. Stuttgart 1892.

tally with his pct theory of justification by faith alone.

In his pamphlet *On the Babylonian Captivity* he viciously attacked the Mass and denied Transubstantiation, without, however, questioning the Real Presence. To save the latter after having rejected the former, he found himself constrained to maintain that the substance of bread and the Body of Christ exist together in the Eucharist. This theory is called Consubstantiation. It was later brought into a system by the orthodox Lutheran theologians and reduced to the technical formula: *" Praesens in, cum et sub pane." 10* Luther, however, undermined it when, urged on by Melanchthon and by his own ardent desire to abolish the *"Deus in pyxide"* and do away with Eucharistic adorations and theophoric processions, he declared in his scurrilous pamphlet " *Pon der IVinkelmesse"* (A. D. 1533), that the Body of Christ is present in the Eucharist only at the moment of its reception in holy Communion *(in usu, non ante vel post usitni).* This theory, carried to its logical conclusion, had to result in a denial of the dogma of the Real Presence. Melanchthon, who leaned to Calvinism, did not find it difficult to eliminate from the Augsburg Confession the orthodox proposition: " The Body and Blood of the Lord are truly present under the form of bread and wine," and to substitute for it the ambiguous phrase: " In the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ is truly exhibited with the bread and the wine," 11 which was acceptable to the Calvinists. The Lutheran and the Calvinistic

10 For further information on this point, *v.* Ch. III, *infra.*

11 Art 10 originally read: *" Sub specie panis et vini corpus et sanguis Domini vere adsunt."* For this Melanchthon substituted: *"In corna Domini cum pane et vino corpus el sanguis Christi vere exhibetur."* The various Protestant confessional statements on the " Lord's Supper "

views continued to exist side by side, until King Frederick William 111 amalgamated the two sects in the so-called "Evangclischc Landeskirchc," the national Church of Prussia, which has since degenerated into almost complete infidelity. The original Lutheran teaching is today upheld only by a small coterie of "orthodox" Lutherans in Germany and the United States.12

β) Luther's conception of the Eucharist was strongly opposed by Hulderic Zwingli of Zurich, who was supported by Carlstadt and Butzer, and especially by Oecolampadius.

Zwingli, as stated above, discovered a figure or trope in the copula *est* and rendered it: "This *signifies* my body," thereby reducing the Eucharist to an empty symbol?8 Carlstadt claimed that when our Lord uttered the words "This is my body," He pointed to Himself.14 Zwingli later on secured influential allies in the Arminians, the Mennonites, the Socinians, and the Anglicans,1r and even to-day the Rationalistic conception of the Lord's Supper does not differ substantially from that of the Zwinglians.

■will be found in the *New Schaff-*Heriog *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* Vol. VII, pp. 35 sq.

12 Cfr. Herzog-Hauck, *Rcalensy·* klopôdie *fur prot. Théologie,* Vol. I, 3rd ed., pp. 65 sqq. *(New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* Vol. VII, p. 37); J. T. Muller, *Die symbolischen Bûcher dor evangclisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 6th ed., Gutersloh 1886.

13 Γ. *supra, Sect.* 1, Art. 2, No. 2. Zwingli's teaching is succinctly stated in that writer's *Opera,* Vol. III, pp. 340 sqq., Zurich 1832.

14 For Luther's opinion of Carlstadt *v.* De Wette, *Luth. Epist.,* II, 576 sqq. On the controversy between Luther and Zwingli regarding the Eucharist sec Hergenrother, *Kirchengeschichtc,* Vol. III, 4th ed., PP. 72 sqq., Freiburg 1909.

16 See the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* Vol. VII, p. 35. On more recent Protestant theories see W. Berning, *Die Einsetzung der hl. Eucharistic* m *ihrer ursprUnglichen Form* pp χ sqq., Münster 1901.

y) In the meantime Calvin, at Geneva, was seeking to bring about a compromise between the extremes of the Lutheran literal and the Zwinglian figurative interpretation of our Lord's words, by suggesting instead of the substantial presence in one case or the merely symbolical presence in the other, a certain mean or "dynamic" presence.

This dynamic presence of Christ he explained as follows: At the moment of reception, the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood, though that Body and Blood are not really present *(secundum substantiam'),* is communicated from Heaven to the souls of the predestined *(secundum virtutem)* and spiritually nourishes them.[16] Owing to Melanchthon's dishonest double-dealing, this intermediary position of Calvin made a strong impression in Lutheran circles, and it was only when the Formula of Concord was framed, in 1577, that the "crypto-Calvinistic venom" was successfully expelled from the body of Lutheran doctrine.[17]

2. The Teaching of the Church.—It was not until the time of Berengarius that the Eucharistic dispute trenched on orthodoxy, thus coni-

10 Cfr. Calvin, *fnstii.,* IV, 17.

17 Calvin's views have been ultimately adopted by the great majority of the so-cailcd "Reformed" churches. Loofs says there are "infinite gradations between the strict Calvinistic belief and the rationalyzing of the Zwinglian view into a mere observance in commemoration of Christ." *(Neto Schaff-Hcrsog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* Vol. VII, p. 35). On modern Calvinism cfr. Λ. Ebrard, *Das einhcllige Bekenntnis dor reformierten Kirche aller Liinder,* Barmen 1887: E. F. K. Muller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche.* Leipzig 1903.— On the whole subject of this subdivision see Winer-Ewald. *Komparahve Darstellnng des Lchrbegriffes der t-erichiedenen christlichen Kirchsnparieien,* n.

polling the Church to define her belief in the Real Presence.

a) Berengarius' view, together with Eriugena's treatise *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini,* to which he had appealed in support of his teaching,[18] were condemned by councils held in Vercelli (1050), Paris (about 1050), and Rome (1059). It was not until he had subscribed to an explicit profession of faith, at another council held in Rome, A. D. 1079, under the presidency of Gregory VII, that Berengarius gave up his heresy. He died reconciled to the Church. The quarrel concerning his Eucharistic teaching lasted altogether some thirty years. The profession of faith to which Berengarius was compelled to subscribe emphasized the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which virtually includes that of the Real Presence.[19] Unlike the heresy of the Protestant Reformers, that of Berengarius never became popular.[20]

b) The Council of Trent met the widely divergent errors of the Protestant Reformers by

XVI, 4th ed., Leipzig 1882; Mohler, Symbolism, 5 35, § 56, and § 68; J. B. Rohm, *Konfcssionelle Lchrgegensatee,* Vol. IV, pp. 73 sqq., Hildesheim 1888.

18 It is a disputed question whether the treatise De *Corpore et Sanguine* Domini attributed to Ratramnus is identical with that o£ Scotus Eriugena. Cfr. on this point, Schceben-Atzberger, Dogmalife, Vol. IV, 2, 561, Freiburg 190t.

1» *" Ego Berengarius corde credo* ci *orc confiteor,* funem *et* vinum, quae foiiunttir in *altari, per* myslcrinni *sacrae orationis et verba* «oriri Redemptoris *substantialiter converti* in veram *et propriam ac vivificalricem carnem et sanguinem lesu Christi Domini nostri et post consecrationem esse verum Christi corpus, quod natum est de Virgine et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce pependit ei quod sedet ad dexteram Patris, ei verum sanguinem Christi,* qui *de latere eius effusus est, non tantum per signum et virtutem sacramenti, sed* in *proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae. . .* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 355).

20 On the concilias/ proceedings in the case of Berengarius see Mansi, *Colled. Concil.,* Vol. XIX Pl>. 757 Sqq., 837 sqq., 897 sqq.; Vol' λA· PP- 523 sqq.

defining the Catholic teaching on the subject. The XIIIth Session is devoted entirely to the Holy Eucharist, and no Catholic can peruse its decrees and canons without being deeply moved. The Council begins with a forthright profession of faith in the Real Presence: "In the first place the holy Synod teaches and openly and simply professes that, in the august Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things." [21] Calling upon Tradition as a witness, the Council points to the "proper and most manifest meaning" of the divine words of institution,[23] and declares it "a most shameful crime" that these plain words should be "wrested by certain contentious and wicked men to fictitious and imaginary tropes, whereby the verity of the Flesh and Blood of Christ is denied, against the universal sense of the Church." [23] The three adverbs "truly, really, and substantially" were not arbi-

1: *"Principio docet S. Synodus et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur, in almo sanctae Eucharistiae sacramento post panis et vini consecrationem Dominum nostrum /esum Christum, verum Deum atque hominem, vere, realiter ac substantialiter sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 874).

23 *"Propriam illam et apertissimam significationem."*

23 *Ibid.: "Indignissimum sane dagitium est, ea (verbal a quibusdam contentiosis et pravis hominibus ad fictitios et imaginarios tropos, quibus veritas carnis et sanguinis Christi negatur, contra universum Ecclesiae sensum detorqueri."*

trarily chosen, but with a view to oppose the three fictitious interpretations of the Reformers, already mentioned. The word *"vcre," i. e. non significative tantum,* was directed against the theory of Zwingli; *"realiter," i. c. non figurative,* against the error of Oecolampadius; *"substantialiter" i. c. non virtualiter tantum,* against Calvin's contention of a purely "dynamic" presence. The teaching thus positively set forth is once more antithetically repeated in the First Canon of the same Session: "If anyone denieth that, in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christi, and consequently the whole Christ, but saith that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue, let him be anathema." [24]

This teaching of Trent has ever been and still is the unwavering belief of the whole of Catholic Christendom.[25]

U Sess. XIII, can. i: "Si *quit* negaverit, in ss. *Eucharistiae sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem una* cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri *lesu Christi ac* proinde totum *Christum, sed dixerit tantummodo esse* in *eo* ut in signo *vel* figura uni *virtute, anathema sit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 883).

2t> A complete collection of all ecclesiastical definitions on the subject of the Eucharist will be found in Schcebcn-Atzherger's *Dogmatik,* Vol. IV. a, pp. 561 sqq., Freiburg 1901.

ARTICLE 2

THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS

The Catholic teaching on the Holy Eucharist can be abundantly proved from the Fathers. In order not to exceed the limits of this treatise we shall have to confine ourselves to the first five centuries. It is these early Fathers whom Calvin invoked in favor of his " dynamic " theory.

The Patristic proofs for our dogma may be divided into direct[1] and indirect testimonies.[2] Almost all extant Patristic passages bearing on the Real Presence are collected in the great five-volume work, *La Perpétuité de la Foi de l'Eglise touchant l'Eucharistie,* of which the first three volumes were published by Nicole and Arnauld between 1669 and 1674, and the last two by Renaudot, between 1711 and 1713, at Paris.[3]

i. Direct Testimonies of the Fathers in Favor of the Dogma of the Real Presence.—As many Protestants admit that the Fathers who lived after the beginning of the fourth century held the Catholic view of the Eucharist, we will

1 *Testimonia simplicia.*

2 *Testimonia argumentosa.*

8 Though Nicole and Arnauld were Jansenists, yet their monumental work on the Eucharist, *Perpétuité de la Foi,* has not yet lost its value *(.Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. XIV, p. 593)·—The student may also consult Franzclin. *De Eucharistia,* thes. 8-to, Rome 1887; Béguinot, *La Tris Sainte Eucharistie. Exposition de la Foi des u Première Siècles, a* vols., Paris 1003·—The most ancient Patristic texts bearing on the Eucharist are conveniently displayed by G. Rauschen, *Florilegium Patrislicum,* Heft 7, Bonn 1900. See also the same author's *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* pp. i St. Louia 1913·

first examine the teaching of those Patristic writers who flourished in the first three centuries.

a) Besides the *Didache,* which is of special importance in regard to the Mass, and which we shall quote in Part III of this treatise, the oldest Patristic witness that can be cited in support of the Church's belief in the Real Presence is St. Ignatius of Antioch (4- about 117).

a) Ignatius writes of the Docetists: "They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer,[4] because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, [that Flesh] which suffered for our sins,[5] and which the Father raised up by His goodness.[6] . . . But it were better for them to love [αγαπάν, *i. e. αγάπην ποιαν* = to celebrate the Eucharist], in order that they also may attain to the resurrection."[7] This "realistic" text, which could be matched by others from the same author,[8] is not contradicted by the "symbolic" reflection in his Epistle to the Trallians: "Be renewed in faith, which is the Flesh of the Lord, and in love, which is the Blood of Jesus Christ,"[9]—a passage that is as unmistakably figurative as the former is literal, since faith and love manifestly neither "suffer" nor "attain to the resurrection." This interpretation is confirmed by a close inspection of the original text, which reads as follows: *Ἀνακτίσασθε ἰαυτοί ἰν* πίστα, ὁ [not fl ἐστιν σαρξ τοϋ Κυρίου, *και ἰν αγάπη,* ‹»

* προσευχή?, i.e. liturgical worskip.

ὑτήυ ευχαριστίαν σάρκα εἰναι τού σωτήροι *ἡμών* 'Ιησού Χριστού τήρ ὑπέρ αμαρτιών ἡμών παϋούσαν. «ήυ τή χρηστότητι ὁ πατήρ *fiytipeV'*

[4] *Ep. ad Smyrn.,* c. *j* (cd. Funk, I, 941); K. Lake. *The Apostolic Fathers,* Vol. I, p. 259, London 1912.

[5] Cfr. *Ep. ad Eph.,* c. 20; *Ep. ad Philad.,* c. 4 (ed. Funk, I, 190, 226).

[6] *Ep. ad Trail.,* c. 8 (ed Funk I. αοβ); K. Lake. *The Apostolic Fathers,* Vol. I, p. îlg.

[not »/] *ίσπν αϊμα* 'Ιησού *Χρίστον, i. e.,* the renewal of faith and love is the Flesh and Blood of Christ, that is to say, the effect of His Flesh and Blood, in other words, a fruit of Holy Communion. The *res sacramenti* stands antonomastically for *sacramentum.*[10]

β) Another ancient witness to the doctrine of the Real Presence is St. Justin Martyr (-|- 167). Disregarding the Discipline of the Secret, that famous apologist says: '* And this food is with us called Eucharist, and no one is permitted to partake of the same, except he who believes that our teaching is true, and who has submitted to that ablution [Baptism] for the forgiveness of sins and unto regeneration, and who lives as Christ hath commanded. For we take this not as common bread,[11] nor as common drink, [12] but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made Flesh by the Divine Logos,[13] had Flesh and Blood for the sake of our salvation, so have we been taught that also the food consecrated by the word of prayer coming from Him, by which our blood and flesh are nourished through conversion [i. *e.* bread and wine], is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus who was made Flesh.[14] For the Apostles have handed it down in their memoirs, which are called Gospels, that it hath been commanded them as follows: Jesus took bread, gave thanks, and said, * Do this in commemoration of me, this is my Body '; and in the same manner He took the chalice, gave thanks, and said, ' This is my Blood,' and gave them all thereof.''[18]

10 Cfr. Schanz, *Die I.ehre von den Sakramenten der hath. Kirche,* p. 334, Freiburg 1893: J. Nirschl, *Die Théologie dee hl. Ignatiue,* pp. 76 sqq., Mayence 1880.

11 *κοινόν Αρτον-*

12 *κοινόν πόμα-*

13 "He who overshadowed the Virgin; " *cfr. Apol.,* I, c. 33 sq.

1« τήρ it' ϊϋχήi λόγον τον *nap'* αντον *(ύχαριστηθιϊσαν τροφήν (i. e.* consecrated), *ίζ* ή* *αlμα καί σάρκοτ* κατά *μιταβοΧήν τρίφονται Ί)μύν, ϊκιΐνου τού σαρκοιτοιηίΗντοτ Ιησού καί σάρκα καί αίμα lirai-lonpol..* I. c. 66 (.Migne. F. *G..* I.XVII, 436). Another important text from Justin Martyr will be

St. Irenaeus of Lyons (-|- 203), a pupil of St. Polycarp of Smyrna, who had personally known the Apostles, upholds the dogma of the Eucharist against the Gnostics as an argument for the resurrection of the flesh, and in so doing plainly teaches the Real Presence. Take this passage, for instance: "He declared the chalice, which is taken from created things, to be His own Blood,in wherewith He penetrates our blood, and the bread, which is also a created thing, to be His own Body,17 wherewith He nourishes our bodies. . . . Wine and bread are by the word of God changed into the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ."18 In another place10 St. Irenæus says: "How can these heretics [the Gnostics] be convinced that the consecrated bread20 is the Body of their Lord, and the cup contains His Blood, if they do not regard Him as the Son of the Creator of the world, *i. e.,* as His Logos, through whom the trees bear fruit, the fountains flow, and the earth produces first a blade of grass, then the ear, and finally, within the ear, the full wheat?"21

St. Hippolytus of Rome (+ 235) says: "The Logos prepared His precious and immaculate Body 22 and His Blood,23 which are daily prepared as a sacrifice 24 on the mysterious divine table, in commemoration of that eternally memorable first table of the mystic divine supper. Come and eat my Bread, and drink the wine which I have

quoted *infra,* Part III, in connection with the Mass. On St. Justin's teaching, cfr. Rauschcn, *Eucharist and Penance,* pp. 5 sq., 30 sqq.. and P.ardcnhewer, *Geschichte der althirchlichcn Literatur,* Vol. I, pp. 239 sq.. Freiburg 1902.

tcalga Ιδιον·
ίδιον σώμα.

13 *Adv. Haer.,* V, 2, 2 sq.

10 *Of. dt;* IV, 18, 4·

20 *άρτον ΐύχαρισθέντα,* = the bread over which thanks have been given.

21 Cfr. L. Hopfenmüllcr, S'. *Irenaeus de Eucharistia,* Bamberg 1867. For the teaching of Clement of Alexandria and Origen see No. 3, *infra,* pp. 69 sqq.

22 σώμα.

23 αίμα-

24 ιπιτίλοϋνται *Ouôpeva.*

mixed for you: He hath given us His own divine Flesh[26] and His own precious Blood[20] to eat and to drink."[27]

y) Though Tertullian (b. about 160) is not always clear, and some of his utterances are open to misinterpretation, he roundly declares his belief in the Real Presence in such passages as these: "The flesh [of Christian believers] is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, in order that the soul, too, may be sated with God."[28] In holy anger he exclaims against the makers and vendors of pagan idols: "The zeal of faith will plead, bewailing that a Christian should come from idols into the church, . . . should apply to the Lord's Body those hands which give bodies to demons. . . . Idol-makers are chosen [even] into the ecclesiastical order. Oh, shame! Once did the Jews lay hands on Christ; but these mangle His Body daily. Oh, hands to be cut off!"[29]

Tertullian's friend and countryman, St. Cyprian (+ 258), interprets the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer with reference to the Holy Eucharist, and concludes his exposition as follows: "Therefore we beg for our bread, *i. e.* Christ, to be given to us every day, in order

26 τήρ *Oelav αύτοΰ σάρκα·*

20 τίμιο» *αύτοΰ αίμα-*

27 *In Proverb.,* IX, 2 (Migne, *P. G.,* LXXX, 593). Achelis *[Hippolytstudien,* p. 159. Leipzig 1897) denies that the fragment on Prov. IX, l-S was composed by St. Hippolytus; but it is undoubtedly genuine in the form in which it was received into the collection of Anastasius Sinaita.

28 *De Resurrect. Carn.,* c. 8 (Migne, *P. D·,* II, 806): *"Caro [Christianorum] corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur.'*

20 *De Idolo!.,* c. 7 (Migne, *P. L„* I, 669): *"Zelus fidei perorabit ingemens Christianum ab idolis in ecclesiam venire, . . . eas manus admovere corpori Domini, quae daemoniis corpora conferunt. . . . Alleguntur in ordinem ecclesiasticum artifices idolorum. Proh scelus! Semel ludaei Christo manus intulerunt, isti quotidie corpus eius lacessunt. O manus praecidendae!"* Cfr. Dieringer, *"Die Abendmahlslehre Tertullians."* in the *Katholik, of* Mayence, 1864, I, 277 sq<|.

that we who remain and live in Christ, may not recede from His sanctification and Body.''[80] St. Cyprian is opposed to giving holy Communion to sinners before they have performed their allotted penance,[31] but allows that in time of persecution they may be forthwith admitted to the Holy Table.[32]

b) After the Nicene Council (A. D. 325) the number of Patristic witnesses grows, and their testimony becomes increasingly clear and positive. The Greek Fathers, in particular, attest their faith in the Real Presence in terms that sometimes smack of exaggeration.

a) Macarius Magnes, who flourished at the beginning of the fourth century,[33] says: "He spoke: 'This is my Body.' Not, therefore, an image of the Body,[34] nor an image of the Blood, as some feeble-minded persons have foolishly asserted, but in truth the Body and Blood of Christ.''[35]

so De Or. Do»:., c. 18 (ed. Harte), I, 280): *"Et ideo pancm* nostrum, i. e. *Christum, dart nobis quotidie petimus,* ut qui in *Christo* manemus cl vivimus, a *sanctificatione eius et corpore non recedamus."*

81 Cfr. De *Lapsis,* 16 (I. *c.,* I, 248): "Fis *infertur corpori eius et* sanguini ef *plus* modo in *Dominum* manibus atque ore delinquunt, quam quum Dominum negaverunt."

32 Cfr. *Ep.* 57 ad *Cornei.,* 2 (I. c., 11, 652): *"Nam quomodo docemus* aut provocamus cos in *confessione* nominis sanguinem suum *fundere, si* iis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus? ''— Cfr. J. Dollinger, *Dic Eucharistie* in den drei *ersten Jahrhundertcn,* Mayence 1826; Ermoni, L'Eucharistie dans *1'Eglisi Primitive,* 2nd ed., Paris 1904; Λ. Struckmann, *Die Gcgenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie nach den schriftlichen Quellen der vornisanischen Zeit,* Vienna 1905.

33 This writer's */Ipocriticus* was first edited in full by C. Blondel, Paris 1876 (Μακαρίου Μαγνητοί Ἀποκριτικόϊ), but a Eucharistic fragment extracted therefrom had been previously published by Pitra *(Spicii. Solesm.,* II, 548 b, Paris 1852). It is this fragment from which we quote in the text (cd. Blondel, p. 106).

84 τύιτοί τού σώματοί.

86 αλλά κατ' ἀλήΟβιαν σώμα καί αίμα Χριστού. On a similar expression employed by the Syrian Bishop Maruthas, v. *supra,* p. 36.

St. Gregory of Nyssa (b. about 331) speaks of the Real Presence in strongly "realistic" terms. He says: "Rightly, therefore, I believe that even to-day the bread, being sanctified by the word of God, is converted into the Body of the Logos-God.[36] . . . This bread, as the Apostle says, is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer, becoming converted into the Body of the Logos, not by eating and drinking, but instantly changing into the Body of the Logos, as has been declared by the Logos Himself: 'This is my Body.' . . . Through an act of grace He implants Himself by the flesh into all the faithful, commingled with the bodies of the faithful, . . . in order that man, by being united with the immortal [Body of Christ], be made to partake of incorruptibility. This gift He bestows in virtue of the power of consecration, by transforming the nature of that which is sensible into that [Body]."[37]

St. Gregory of Nazianzus (4- about 390) says: "Doubt not when thou hearest of the Blood of God, but without taking scandal unhesitatingly eat the Body[38] and drink the Blood,[39] if thou desirest to have life."[40]

St. Basil (+ 379) [41] and St. Athanasius (4- 373) [43] express themselves in similar terms.

/3) Our two principal witnesses among the Greek Fathers are St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. John Chrysostom.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) dwells on the Eucharist in the last two chapters of his famous *Catecheses Mystagogicae.* After quoting the words of institution,[93]

30 *els σώμα τού θεού Λόγου μεταττοιεϊσΟαι·*

37 *rjj τήί eùKoylas δυνάμει irphs ίκεΐνο (σώμα) μΐταστοιχειώσα3 τών φαινομένων* τήρ *φΰσιν- Or. Catcch.,* c. 37 (Migne, *P. G.,* XLV, 93 sq.>.

■'w </>άγε το *σώμα·*

80 *nie* τὸ *αιμα.*

io *Or.,* 45. η. ιρ.

'Ιΐ Cfr. Chr. Pesch, *Praeiret. Dogmat.,* Vol. VI, 3rd cd., pp. a8z jk i.

'I2 His teaching *is* explained by Atzbergcr, *Dio Logoslehro dot hl. Alhanasiui,* pp. 219 «]<]., Munich 1880.

according to the version given by St. Paul, he asks: "Since He [Christ] Himself, therefore, said of the bread: 'This is my Body,' who will venture to waver? And since He Himself assures us: 'This is my Blood,' who should ever doubt that it is His Blood? At Cana in Galilee He once converted[43] water into wine, which is akin to blood. Is He undeserving of belief when He converts wine into blood?[44] . . . Therefore, let us receive it with full conviction as the Body and Blood of Christ. For under the appearance of bread[45] thou receivest the Body, and under the appearance of wine,[40] the Blood, in order that through the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ thou mayest become of one body and blood with Him.[47] In this way, too, we are made bearers of Christ,[48] since His Body and Blood arc received into our members. . . . Hence do not regard it as mere bread and wine; for according to the Lord's assurance it is the Body and Blood of Christ. Though the senses[40] seem to tell thee otherwise, faith[00] gives thee certainty. Do not judge by the taste,[01] but obtain from faith the indubitable certitude that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . Having been thus instructed and convinced that what appears to be bread is not bread,[02] though it seem thus to the taste, but the Body of Christ, and what appears to be wine is not wine,[03] though it seem thus to the taste, but the Blood of Christ, . . . strengthen thy heart by eating this bread as a spiritual food, and make glad the face of thy soul." [04]

43 μεταβίβληκερ.
44 olpop μεταβαλώρ els αίμα-
45 ip τύπψ δρτου.
46 ip τύπψ οίρου.
47 σύσσωμο; καί σύραιμο; αύτοϋ.
48 χριστοφόροι.
49 ή αΓσβησίi-
ή πίστιι·
91 από τή; *yeiveus·*
f'·- ό φαιρόμερο; άρτο; *ούκ Άρτο*
93 ό φαιρόμερο; o !pos εστιρ. *ούκ olvôs*

The "Doctor of the Eucharist" *par excellence* is St. Chrysostom. None of the Fathers has inculcated the Real Presence so frequently and in such "realistic," not to say exaggerated, language as he. Pointing to the altar he says: "Thou approachest a fearful, a holy sacrifice. Christ lies there slain,[65] to reconcile thee ... to the Creator of the universe."[60] In another place he writes: "When you enter the church, do not believe that you receive the divine Body from a man, but you shall believe to receive the divine Body like the live coal from the tongs of the Seraphim [in the prophecy of Isaias] and you shall drink the salutary Blood as if you sucked it with your lips from the divine and immaculate side."[67] And again: "That which is in the chalice, is the same as that which flowed from the side of Christ, and of this we are made partakers. . . . What the Lord did not tolerate on the cross [i. *e.,* the breaking of his limbs], He tolerates now in the sacrifice,[68] through love of thee; He permits Himself to be broken into pieces,[69] so that all may be filled to satiety. . . . The wise men adored this Body when it lay in the manger; they prostrated themselves before it in fear and trembling. Now you behold the same Body which the wise men adored in the manger, lying upon the altar; you also know its virtue and salutary effect. . . . Already in the present life this mystery changes the earth for you into Heaven; the sublimest thing that is there,— the Body of the Lord,— you can behold here on earth. Yea, you not only behold it, but you touch it and eat it."[70]

(Migne, *P. G.,* XXXIII, 1098 eqq.). On the terminology of St. Cyril, see *infia* pp. 7~ sq.

65 *εσφαλμένο» πρόκειται i* Xpf *OT0».*

60 *Hem. de Prod. Indae,* I, 6.

67 *Hom. da Poenil.,* IX. n. 1.

5S ἐπΐ rijs προσφορά».

59 ανέχεται διακΚύμενο».

oo *Hom. in* ι *Cor.,* XXIV, η. ι.

One of the most forcible passages in the writings of St. Chrysostom—a veritable *locus classicus* — is the following: "How many now-a-days say: Would that I could gaze upon His form, His figure, His raiment, His shoes! Lo! thou seest Him, touchest Him, eatest Him. He gives Himself to thee, not merely to look upon, but even to touch, to eat, and to receive within thee.01 . . . Consider at whose table thou eatest! For we arc fed with that which the angels view with trepidation and which they cannot contemplate without fear because of its splendor. We become one mass with Him: we are become one body and one flesh with Christ.02 . . . What shepherd feeds His sheep with his own flesh? Some mothers entrust their new-born infants to nurses; this He did not wish to do, but He nourishes us with His own Blood, He unites Himself with us. These are not deeds of human power. . . . We take the place of servants; it is He who consecrates and transmutes [the bread and wine]."03

7) St. Cyril of Alexandria (4· 444)› because of his opposition to Nestorius, concerned himself with the "life-giving virtue of the flesh of Christ" mainly from the point of view of the Hypostatic Union.04 But there are two passages in his works where he teaches the Real Presence as well as Transubstantiation simply and without any controversial bias. The first of these reads as follows: "As a life-giving Sacrament we possess the sacred Flesh of Christ and His precious Blood under the appearances of bread and wine,85 in order that we may

βΧαΟτδχ δέ (αυτόν δίδωσι ούκ Ιδίΐι· *μόνον,* άλλα καί άψασβαι καί *4>a.ytiv* καί λαβόν ϊνδον·

vtyeyôvayxv ήμιίχ σώμα *iv* καί σαρξ μία·

«3 Hom. in *Maith.,* 8a L83I, n. χ sqq. Cfr. Bardcnhewcr-Sliahan, *Patrology,* pp. 34» sq.; A. Nâglc, *Die Eucharisliclchre des hl.* CViryroifomuj. ρρ. 8 sqq., Freiburg igoo.

β* *V. infra,* pp. 70 sq.

οt> ώ> *iv &ρτω* καί οϊνψ.

not be struck with terror if we see flesh and blood lying upon the holy altars of our churches, God [by the consecration] breathed living power into the proffered gifts and converted them into the energy of His own flesh.'"* The second passage runs thus: "Pointing to the bread, the Lord spake: 'This is my Body,' and to the wine: 'This is my Blood,' in order that thou shouldst not imagine that what thou seest is merely an image,07 but that thou shouldst believe that the gifts are in a mysterious way truly converted into the Body and Blood of Christ."

The testimonies of the Syriac Fathers have been collected by Th. Lamy in his work *De Syrorum Fide et Disciplina in Re Eucharistica.*00

c) The Latin Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries are no less clear and emphatic than their Greek colleagues in asserting the Real Presence.

a) St. Hilary (-|- 366), the doughty champion of th'e faith against the Arians of the West, writes; "He [Christ] Himself says: 'My Flesh is truly meat, and my Blood is truly drink; he that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, abideth in me, and I in him.' Of the verity of the Flesh and Blood there is no room left for doubting. For now both by the declaration of the Lord Himself, and by our faith, it is truly Flesh and it is truly Blood; and these, when eaten and drunk, effect that we are in Christ and Christ is in us. Is this not the truth?"70

o» *μΐΟΙστ-ησιν αύτύ. irpot ίνίρ-γειαν τήί ίαvroû σαρκύί- <Jn Lucam, 22,* 19)·

βτ *τύπον elvai τα φαινύμίνα.*

os *μεταποιιίσΟαι tis σώμα καί αίμα Χριστού κατά τό* ἀληὸὸ· *(/,, Maith.. 26, 27).* Cfr. Slruckniann. *Die Eucharuticlehre det hl. Cyrill ven AlftaJrin,* Paderborn

0» Louvain 1859.— For other Patristic texta bearing on thia subject see Franzelin. *De Eucharirtie.* pp. 85 S.|<b

St. Ambrose (4- 397), in his famous treatise *De Mysteriis,* which forms such an admirable counterpart to the *Catecheses Mystagogicae* of St. Cyril, instructs his neophytes on the nature of the Eucharist. After pointing out its Old Testament types (the manna, the water that came forth from a rock at Moses' command, etc.), he continues: "This was done as a figure for us. You know the higher things; for light is superior to darkness, truth to figure, the body of the Author to the manna from heaven."[71] To explain Transubstantiation the same writer recalls how the words of Moses turned a rod into a serpent, how Elias called down fire from heaven, how God created the universe out of nothing, and then asks: " Shall not the words of Christ have power to change the appearances of the elements? . . . Cannot, therefore, the words of Christ, who was able to make something out of nothing, change that which already exists into something which it was not before? . . . What we effect [by consecration], is the Body taken from the virgin. Why dost thou here seek the order of nature, since the Lord Jesus, bom of a virgin, is Himself above nature? Truly, therefore [is this] the Flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried; truly, therefore, is it th,e Sacrament of His flesh."[72]

gui» meus *vere est potus;* qui *edit carnem meam ct bibit* sanguinem meum, in me manet *ct ego* in *eo.' De* veritate carni» et »ang«ini» non relictu» est ambigendi *locus. Nunc* enim et ipsius Domini *professione et* fide nostrâ vere caro est *ct vere* sanguis est; *et haec accepta atque hausta id* efficiunt, ut et nos in *Christo et* Christus in nobis sit. *Anne hoc veritas* non est? "

71 De Myst., c. 8, n. 49: " Haec in figura *facta* sunt nostra. Cognalu* *quam umbra, veritas quam figura, corpus auctoris quam manna de caelo."*

72 Op. cit., IX, 51 sq.: *"Non valebit Christi sermo, ut species* mutet *elementorumf . . . Sermo ergo Christi, qui* potuit e* *nihilo facere* quod non erat, non *potest ea quae sunt* in id mutare, quod *non erantP . . . Hoc quod conficimus, corpus ex Virgine est; quid hic quaeris* naturae *ordinem,* quum *praeter naturam sit ipse Dominus lesus partus ex* Virgine? *Vera* utique *caro*

β) The writings of St. Augustine (-J- 430) contain no such striking passages. The probable reason is that he found no Eucharistic heresy to combat and felt more strictly bound by the Discipline of the Secret.[7'] Addressing himself almost exclusively to persons already initiated into the Christian mysteries, the Bishop of Hippo dwelt chiefly on the necessity and value of holy Communion and had no occasion to discuss the dogma of the Real Presence. The enemies of the Church do not scruple to maintain that he was an out-and-out "Symbolist."[74] In the opinion of Loofs,[75] St. Augustine "never gave a thought to the reception of the true Body and Blood of Christ." Adolph Harnack[7®] declares that St. Augustine "in this respect was undoubtedly of one mind with the so-called pre-Reformation and with Zwingli." Against this unwarranted contention Catholics set the undoubted fact that Augustine professed belief in Transubstantiation. "'That which is seen on the tabic of the Lord," he says, "is bread and wine; but this bread and this wine, when the word is added, becomes the Body and Blood of the Logos."[77] And again: "This bread which you see upon the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the Body of Christ; this chalice, or rather that which it contains, sanctified by the word of God, is the Blood of Christ."[78] St. Augustine further-

Christi, quae crucifixa est, quae scfulta est: vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est,"

73 ΓΛ *infra, No. 3,* p. 74.

74 Sec Sclianz, *"Die Lchre des Augustinus uber die Eucharistie,"* in the *Thcol. Quartalschrift of* Tubingen, 1896. pp- 79 sqq.

75 *Dogmengeschichte,* 4th ed., p. 409, Halle 1906.

70 *Dogmengeschichte,* 3rd ed., p. 148, Freiburg >897.

77 *Serm.,* 5 (ed. Caillou, p. ra, Paris 184a): *"Hoc quod videtur it» mensa Domini, fanis est et vinum; sed iste fanis ct hoc vinum accedente verbo fit corfus et sanguis Verbi."*

78 *Serm.,* 227: *"Ponis ille, quem videtis in altari, sanclificatus fer verbum Dei corfus est Christi: colis ille, imo quod habet colis, sanctificatum fer verbum Dei sanguis est Christi."*

more declares that "Christ carried Himself in His own hands," and that we owe divine worship to the Eucharist/0 Moreover, it is not fair to detach the great Doctor's teaching on the Eucharist from his teaching on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, where he clearly and unequivocally asserts that the true Body and Blood of Christ are offered on the altar.80

We may conclude the Patristic testimonies with a quotation from Pope St. Leo the Great (+ 461), who says: "The Lord avers (John VI, 54): 'Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you.' Hence you should so partake of this sacred table that you have no doubt whatever concerning the truth of the Body of Christ. For that is consumed with the mouth which is believed by faith, and in vain do those respond 'Amen' who dispute against that which is received." 81

ïo Enorr. in *Ps.,* 33, I, 10: *"Et ferebatur* in *manibus suis* (1 *Reg.* a«). *Hoc vero, fratres, quomodo possit fieri in homine, quii intelligaf?* Quis enim *portatur in manibus* suis! *Manibus aliorum potest portari homo, manibus suis nemo portatur. . . .* In *Christo autem invenimus. Ferebatur* enim *Christus* in manibus suis, *quando commendans* ipsum *corpus suum ait: Hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim illud corpus* in manibus *suis."*— *Enarr.* in Ps., 98, n. 9: "Quia carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit, nemo autem carnem *illam manducat* nisi prius *adoraverit,* inventum est, quemadmodum adoretur tale *scabellum* pedum Domini (Ps. 98, s), et non solum non peccemus *adorando, sed peccemus* non adorando." (Cfr. Pohle-Preuss, *Christology,* pp. 286 sq.)

60 Cfr. Serm., 3 (cd. Caillou, p. 9): *"A solis ortu usque ad occasum, sicuti a prophetis praedictum est, immolatur. . . . Non adhuc de gregibus pecorum hostia cruenta conquiritur, non ovis aut hircus divinis altaribus admovetur, sed sacrificium iam nostri temporis corpus et sanguis est ipsius Sacerdotis. . . . Cum timore et tremore ad participationem huius altaris accedite. Hoc agnoscite in pane, quod pependit* in *cruce; hoc* in *calice, quod* manavit *ex latere."*— Cfr. O. Blank, Die *Lehrc des hl. Augustin vom S'akramente der Eucharistic,* Paderborn 1907; IC Adam, *Die Eucharistielchrc des hl. Augustin,* Paderborn 1908.

si *Scrm.,* 91, c. 3: *"Dicente Domino: 'Nisi manducaveritis,' etc.* (Ioα. vi, 54), *âc sacrae mensae communicare debetis,* ut nihil *prorsus de* veritate *corporis Christi ct sanguinis ambigatis. Hoc enim ore*

2. Indirect Testimonies.—The Christological heresies of the early centuries naturally affected the doctrine of the Eucharist, though only in an indirect manner. Few heretics openly attacked the Real Presence. Some even dared to use this dogma to bolster their erroneous teaching on the Person of our Lord. The Patristic writers who defended the Catholic doctrine had little trouble to refute this class of opponents. They showed how those who admitted the Real Presence were inconsistent in their Christological teaching, while those who pretended to base their errors on the Eucharist, were unwilling witnesses to the truth of that dogma.

a) The Church teaches that there are two natures in Christ, one divine, the other human, and that these two natures are hypostatically united in one Person.

a) One of the first heretics to deny the Divinity of our Lord was Paul of Samosata, who tried to prove the corruptibility, and consequently the non-divinity, of the Eucharistic Blood from the fact that it is divided into parts when received in Holy Communion. Dionysius the Great of Alexandria (-f- 264) answered this specious objection as follows: "As little as the Holy Ghost is perishable because He is poured forth into our hearts, just so little is the Blood of Christ corruptible, which is not the blood of a mortal man, but of the true God, who

sumitur, quod fide creditur, et frustra ab Ulis 'Amen' respondetur, a quibus contra id. quod accipitur. disputatur." (Migne, *P. L.,* LIV, 45a).— Other Latin Father» are copiously quoted by Franselin. *De Eucharistia,* pp. 114 sqq.

is a well-spring of joy for all who partake therefrom." 82

The Arians argued that, as there is but a moral union between the Eucharistic Christ and the devout communicant, so the union between the Three Persons of the Trinity, which is the prototype of the former,83 must also be a purely moral one. St. Hilary refuted this erroneous contention by demonstrating the consubstantiality of Christ with His Father from the real union that exists between the Eucharistic Body and its recipient in Holy Communion.84

At the opposite extreme stood the Docetae, who denied the reality of Christ's human body. They were refuted by St. Ignatius of Antioch85 and other ancient Fathers by simple reference to the Holy Eucharist. He who has a real body in the Blessed Sacrament, they argued, cannot have had a merely apparitional or phantom body during His sojourn on earth. Tertullian employed the same argument against the Gnostics.80

/3) The dogma of the Hypostatic Union of the two natures in Christ was attacked by the Nestorians and the Monophysites. The former maintained that there

82 *Opera Dionys. Alexandr.,* p. 233, Rome 1796.

83 Cfr. John VI, 57; XVII, 2X sqq.

84 St. Hilary, *De Trinitate,* VIII, 135 "Si *vere Verbum caro factum ett et vere nos Verbum carnem cibo dominico sumimus, quomodo non naturaliter manere in nobis existimandus est,* qui *et* noturam *carnis nostrae . . . assumpsit et naturam carnis suae ad naturam aeternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandae carnis admiscuitP . . . Si vere homo ille, qui ex Maria natus fuit, Christus est nosque vere sub mysterio carnem corporis sui sumimus et per hoc unum erimus, quia Pater in eo est et ille in nobis, quomodo voluntatis unitas asseritur, quum naturalis per sacramentum proprietas perfectae sacramentum sit unitatis?"*

88 *Ep. ad Smyrn., 7.*

Be Adv. Marcion., IV, 40: *"Sic et in calicis mentione testamentum constituens sanguine suo obsignatum substantiam corporis confirmavit. Nullius enim corporis sqnguis potest esse nisi carnis. Nam etsi qua corporis qualitas non carnea opponetur nobis, certe sanguinem nisi carnea non habebit. Ita consistit probatio corporis de testimonio carnis, probatio carnis de testimonio sangui-*

are two Persons in the God-man, while the latter asserted that He has but one nature. Against the Nestorians, St. Cyril of Alexandria argued as follows: "'Who is He that said: 'Whosoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood, abides in me and I in him'? If it were a mere man who became like unto us, and not rather the God-Logos, that which happens [in Communion] would be anthropophagy,87 and participation therein were useless." " The Monophysites, on the other hand, asserted that as bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, so humanity was converted into Divinity in the Hypostatic Union. They were met by Theodoret, St. Ephraem, Gelasius, and other orthodox writers with the statement that the human nature in the Hypostatic Union remains quite as unchanged as the physical accidents of bread and wine in the Eucharist after the consecration.89

b) Holy Communion was cited by the earliest Patristic authors as an argument for the resurrection of the flesh. Thus St. Irenæus wrote against the Gnostics: "How can they say that the flesh will decay and does not participate in the life,— [that flesh] which is nourished by the Body of the Lord and by His Blood?90 Let them, therefore, change their opinion or cease to offer up these things. Our faith, on the contrary, is consonant with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our faith."91

St. Cyril of Alexandria develops the same thought as follows: "Although death, which has come upon us on account of sin, subjects the human body to the necessity of decay, nevertheless we shall surely rise again because Christ is in us through His Flesh; for it is incredible,

87 *ἀνάριοποφαγία-*
88 *Contra Nestor.,* IV, $.
se J'. *infra.* Ch. V, Sect. *i.*
oo àiri› τοὐ *σώμα-ros roi Kvpiav* καὶ *atparos αντού·*
81 *Haer.,* IV. 18, 4-

nay impossible, that the Life should not vivify those in whom it is."[02]

3. Solution of Patristic Difficulties.— The difficulties that arise concerning the Eucharistic teaching of some of the Fathers may be accounted for on three general grounds: (1) these Fathers felt secure in the possession of the truth; (2) they had a distinct preference for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture; and (3) they were bound by the Discipline of the Secret.

a) We will first consider these general reasons and then examine some of the doubtful texts.

a) The doctrine of the Real Presence was not seriously impugned before the eleventh century; hence, for the first one thousand years of the Church's history, the truth was in peaceful and secure possession of the field.

During this period the faithful had a deep and unquestioning belief in the Real Presence. This feeling of security is probably responsible for some loose statements and a certain inaccuracy on the part of some of the early theologians. The obscure and ambiguous utterances that occur in their writings are more than counterbalanced, however, by a number of others that are perfectly clear and evident,[03] and by every rule of sound hermeneutics the former should be explained by the latter.[84]

»2 In *loa.,* 6. 55, lib. IV, a.— Similarly Tertuliian (De Rejurr. Carnis, c. 8) and many other Patristic writers.— On the subject ot this subdivision cfr. Heinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmat. Theol.,* Vol. IX, § 530.

03 *V. sufra.* Nos. 1 and 2.

04 It was slicer ignorance that dictated Calvin's remark: ·· *Constat*

β) Some of the Fathers, especially those belonging to the so-called Alexandrian school (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Cyril), showed a marked preference for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

This tendency found a salutary counterpoise in the way in which the literal interpretation was cultivated by the school of Antioch (Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodorei), whose methods were espoused by St. John Chrysostom.05 The allegorical sense which the Alexandrians emphasized, did not, of course, exclude the literal sense, but rather supposed it as a working basis (at least in the New Testament), and hence the realistic phraseology of Clement, Origen, and Cyril can be readily accounted for.00 Clement (-{- 217), despite his allegoric tendencies, obviously professed the Real Presence, for he says: "The Lord gives us this very appropriate food. He offers His flesh and pours out His Blood,97 and nothing is wanting for the growth of the children. O incomprehensible mystery!"98 Origen (-f- 254), who frequently speaks of the Eucharistic Bread as "the sign of the Logos," and regards meditation on the Logos as "a paschal feast," did not allow the Discipline of the Secret to prevent him from publicly professing his belief in the Real Presence. He says: "We eat loaves of bread which, through prayer, have become

vetustos omnes scriptores, qui totis quinque saeculis post Apostolos rïvcrunl, *uno ore nobis patrocinari."*

05 *In Is.,* V, 7: *" Πανταχοϋ τήί •γραφή! oiros ό νομοί, èneibàν ἀλληγορπ· Myeiv καί αλληγορία! την ippevclav."* (Migne, *P. G.,* LVI. 60).

00 Cfr. Pl>. Hergenrother. *Die antiochenische Schult,* Wurzburg 1866; Kihn, *Bcdeutung der antiochenischen E.regetenschule,* Wurzburg 1866.

07 σάρκα ipëyei και αίμα Ικχΐΐΐ-

08 *ύ τού παραδόξου μυστηρίου. (.Poedag.,* I, 6; Migne, *P. G.,* VIH, 30a).

a certain holy Body,[00] which purifies those who eat it with a clean heart.''[100]

Among the Latin Fathers St. Augustine is almost the only one whose attitude has given rise to controversy.[101]

γ) Because of the strictness with which the Discipline of the Secret was maintained in the early centuries, some of the Fathers in their sermons and popular writings did not express themselves as clearly on the Holy Eucharist as might otherwise have been expected.

The Discipline of the Secret was enforced in the East until the end of the fifth, and in the West down to the middle of the sixth century. It concerned principally the Eucharist. Origen says: "He who has been initiated into the mysteries knows the flesh of the Logos-God; let us therefore no longer dwell on that which is known to the initiate, but must not be revealed to the uninitiate.''[10B] St. Epiphanius (+ 403), in a letter addressed to the clergy and magistrate of the city of Suedra, repeats our Saviour's words of institution in this rather strange form: "Ελαβε τάδε και ευχαρίστησαν είπε· τοϋτό μου έστ'ι τάδε.[103] St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom often employ the expression: *"Norunt initiati* — ίσασιν οί πιστοί.[104]

b) Aside from these general considerations, we may reduce the Patristic difficulties regarding

σώμα *âyi&v* τι.

100 C. *Cels.,* VHI, *33.*

101 *V.* supra, pp. 67 sq. Other Patristic texts, including such as favor an allegorical interpretation, in Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church.* pp. 7 8<|q.

102 *Hom.* in *Levit.,* IX, n. 10.

103 *Incorat.,* c. 57 (Migne, *P. G* , XLIII, 117).

104 Cfr. Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. S2 sqq

the dogma of the Real Presence to four distinct categories.[105]

a) The Fathers do not always draw a clear-cut distinction between the sacramental species *(species panis et vini)* on the one hand, and the Body and Blood of Christ *(corpus et sanguis Christi)* on the other.

For want of a more accurate terminology, they often refer to the sacramental species as "signs," "types," "symbols," or "figures." However, they are far from employing these terms in the Protestant sense. They simply mean to say that the species of bread and wine are visible signs, types, or symbols of the invisible Body of Christ. The Tridentine Council itself declares that "the most Holy Eucharist . . . is a symbol of a sacred thing and a visible form of an invisible grace."[100] Carefully distinguishing these two factors, St. Cyril of Jerusalem opposes the "type of bread"[107] to the "antitype of the body,"[108] thereby not denying but emphasizing the Real Presence.[100] Tertullian is to be understood in the same sense when he says: *"Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit 'hoc est corpus meum' dicendo, i. e., figura corporis mei; figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus."*[110] Bardenhewer explains this passage as follows: "In the sentence *'hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei,'* the

100 We here follow Cardinal Franzelin *(De Eucharistia,* thes. 10).

100 Sess. XIII, cap. 3: ". . . *symbolum rei sacrae et invisibilis gratiae formam visibilem."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 876).

101 τύπ-os *&ρτον·*

108 *ivrlrvirof σύματοί.*

100 *Catech. Myslag.,* V, n. 20: *" Qui enim gustant, non panem et* t'inum *gustare tabentur, sej amitypum corporis et sanguinis Christi (Avrlrvirov σώματο! καί αίματαιί."* (Aligne. *P. G.*. XXXIII, 1113).

110 *Contr. Harriott., IV.* 40.

words '*figura corporis mci*' are not meant to elucidate the subject *'hoc' (per hyperbaton),* but the predicate *'corpus vicum* the true body is present under the image of bread.''[111] In the light of this interpretation St. Augustine, too, can be understood in a perfectly orthodox sense when he writes: *"Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere: 'Hoc est corpus meum,' quum signum daret corporis sui."*[112] He means that the *"signum"* contains Christ Himself, because the point he wishes to make, according to the context, is that the Holy Eucharist is a sign or symbol of the Body of Christ in the same sense in which the presence of blood in an animal is a sign of the brute soul.''[3]

Other obscure or ambiguous Patristic texts can be satisfactorily explained if we remember that the Eucharistic elements (bread and wine) were sometimes called ''types'' or ''antitypes'' of the Body and Blood of Christ even before the consecration,[114] and that not infrequently the sacramental Body is represented as a "type" or "antitype" of our Saviour's natural body in Heaven.[115]

β) The Fathers often regard the Body of Christ according to its threefold mode of being: the *status connaturalis mortalis,* in which it appeared during His earthly career in Palestine;

111 *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur,* Vol. 11, p. 391, Freiburg 1903.— Λ different interpretation of the passage is given by Rauschcn, *Eucliorirt and Penance,* p. 12.— Cfr. C. L. Leimbach, *Beitriige cur Abendniahlslehre Tertulliani,* p. 83, Gotha 1874.

112 Conlr. *Adimant. Munich.,* c. 12, 3 (Migne, P. *L.*. XLII, 144).

113 Cfr. Chr. Pesch, *Praclect. Dogmat.*. Vol. VI, 3rd cd., p. 293.

114 See the proceedings of the Second Council of Nicaea, A. D. 787 (Hardouin, *Coll. Concil.*. IV, 370).

115 Cfr. St. John Damascene, *De* Iv· ■> P. G-, XCIV, 1146 sqq.).

the *status connaturalis gloriosus,* which is its transfigured state in Heaven; and the *status sacramentalis,* in which it exists in the Holy Eucharist. In the first of these states they call it the true Body of Christ, in the second and third, His "typical," "antitypical," or "symbolic" Body.[11]

Such language easily gives rise to misunderstanding. Instead of emphasizing the numerical identity of the Body in all three states, the ancient Fathers, never fearing to be misunderstood, often speak of the true Body of Christ in the Eucharist as the "type" or "symbol" of the same true Body in its natural state, both on earth and in Heaven, and with this relation in mind, characterize it as a "spiritual Body."[117] In employing this phraseology they no more wish to deny the reality of the sacramental Body than did St. Paul when he said in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, that our own natural body "shall rise a spiritual body" in the resurrection of the dead.[118] St. Augustine is quite plain on this point; he puts into the mouth of our Saviour the following interpretation of the words of institution: "Understand the words I have spoken in a spiritual sense; it is not this body you see, which you are about to eat, nor are you about to drink that blood which those shall shed who will crucify me. It is a sacrament that I have given to you; understood spiritually, it will give you life; though it is necessary to celebrate this [sacrament] visibly, yet it must be understood in an invisible manner."[119]

110 *V.* Art. I, No. 1, *sufra.*

nt *Cerfus sfirituale, σώμα rrw ματικόν.*

ns. Cor. XV. 44·

lio£»iarr. in *Ps.,* 98. n. 9 (Migne, *P. L.,* XXXVII. 1»6S): *" Sfirituaaliter inlelligite, quod loculus sum; non hoc corfus, quod videtis. manducaturi estis, et bibitun illum sanguinem. quem fusuri sunt qui*

y) A further source of misunderstanding is the habit which some of the Fathers have of representing the Holy Eucharist as a "sign of the mystical Christ," *i. e.* the effective symbol of our spiritual union with His mystic body, the Church.

In this union there are two factors: sacramental communion as the cause, and the mystic union of the recipient with the Church, as the effect. Where both are duly emphasized, there is no room for misunderstanding. But certain of the Fathers, especially St. Augustine, often dwell on the latter alone, without mentioning the former. It should be noted that when he speaks of the nature of the Eucharist, St. Augustine is invariably addressing initiated Christians, who are familiar with the dogma of the Real Presence. To such he could say without danger of being misinterpreted: "Therefore, if thou wilt understand the Body of Christ, listen to the Apostle who says: 'But you are the Body of Christ and His members.' Your sacrament is placed on the Lord's table, you will receive your sacrament. . . . For you hear the words, 'The Body of Christ,' and you answer 'Amen.' Be a member of the Body of Christ, in order that your 'Amen' may be a true one." 120

me crucifigent: sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, spiritualités intellectum vivificabit vos; etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tomen invisibiliter intelligi." — Cfr. M. M. Wilden, *Die Lehre des hl. Augustinus vom Opfer der Eucharistie,* Schaffhausen 1864.

120 St. Augustine, Serm., 272: *"Corpus ergo Christi si vis intclligere, Apostolum audi dicentem: 'Vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra.' Mysterium vestrum in mensa dominica positum est, mysterium vestrum accipietis . . . Audis enim: 'Corpus Christi' et respondes: 'Arnen.' Esto mem-*

..... L·., ΛΛΛΥΙΙΙ, 1246).—Cfr. O. Blank, *Die Lehre des hl. Augustin vom Sakramente ?"*.....w. *V* rad.r-born «907.

8) Another important point to be noted in interpreting obscure and ambiguous Patristic passages on the Real Presence is this: Besides the three modes of being peculiar to Christ's Body, as we have explained, the Fathers distinguish three ways in which that Body may be consumed: (i) "capharnaitically," as human flesh is eaten by cannibals; (2) "merely sacramentally," when the recipient is in the state of mortal sin and therefore derives no spiritual profit from communion; (3) "worthily," *i. c.* with full spiritual benefit.

The first of these ways of receiving Communion was rejected by our Lord Himself.[121] St. Augustine does not hesitate to brand it as a "crime." Christ, he says, could not possibly have meant that we should eat His Body in this grossly literal fashion. The Saviour's words: "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," he explains as follows: "This seems to enjoin a crime or a vice. It is therefore a figure, enjoining that we should have a share in the sufferings of our Lord, and that we should retain a sweet and profitable memory of the fact that His Flesh was wounded and crucified for us."[122] That St. Augustine, in writing thus, did not mean to deny the Real Presence is evident from his declaration that only he who receives Communion worthily "eats the

121 *V. supra,* pp. 19 sq.

122 *De Doctrina Christ.,* III, 34: *"Facinus vel flagitium videtur tubere. Figura est ergo, fraecificns passioni dominicae communicandum*

Body of Christ," whereas he who approaches the Holy Table in the state of mortal sin, docs *not* " cat " it, *i. e.,* unto salvation.123

ARTICLE 3

THE ARGUMENT FROM PRESCRIPTION

By means of the Patristic texts above quoted and other available data it is possible to trace the constant belief of the faithful in the dogma of the Real Presence through the Middle Ages back to the Apostolic period. This is called the argument from prescription.

Every such reasoning rests on the following syllogism: A doctrine which has always, everywhere, and by all *(semper, ubique et ab omnibus)* been held to be of faith, must be divinely revealed. Now, in the Catholic Church such and such a doctrine has been held as an article of faith always, everywhere, and by all the faithful. Consequently, it is a divinely revealed truth.

We proceed to demonstrate the minor premise of this syllogism with reference to the dogma of the Real Presence.

I. The Period From a. d. 1900 to 800.—The interval that has elapsed since the Reformation receives its entire character from the Council of

128 Cfr. Tr. in *loa.,* 27, n. 11: *" Hoc ergo* totum *ad hoc nobis valeat, ui carnem Christi et sanguinem Christi non edamus tanluin in sacramento, quod et multi mali, sed usque ad spiritus participationem manducemus et bibamus,* ut in *Domini corpore tamquam membra maneamus."* (Migne, *P. L.,* XXXV, 1621).— On a fourth method of communicating, *vic.:* purely spiritual communion, see *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XIII, cap. 8 (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 881).— On the main topic of this subdivision cfr. Schwanc, *Dogmengcschichtc dor patristischcn Zeil,* Vol. II, 2nd cd., pp. 773 8llq.i prcj' burg >895; Heinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmalischc Théologie,* Vol. IX, § S3,

Trent, and hence we may here pass it over. For the time of the Reformation we have the testimony of Luther,[1] [2] that the whole of Western Christendom, down to the appearance of Carlstadt, Zwingli, and Calvin, firmly believed in the Real Presence.

This firm and universal belief,— omitting the temporary vagaries of Wiclif, the Albigenses, and the adherents of Pierre de Bruis,— was in uninterrupted possession since Berengarius of Tours (d. 1088), in fact, if we except one solitary writer (Scotus Eriugena), since Paschasius Radbertus (831). Berengarius died repentant in the pale of the Church, and Paschasius Radbertus never attacked the substance of the dogma. We may, therefore, maintain that the entire Western Church has believed in the Real Presence for fully eleven centuries.

But how about the Orient? Photius, when he inaugurated the Greek schism in 869, took over the inalienable treasure of the Catholic Eucharist. This treasure the Greek Church had preserved intact when the negotiations for reunion were conducted at Lyons, in 1274,' and at Florence, in 1439. The Greeks vigorously defended it against the machinations of the Calvinistic-minded Patriarch Cyril Lucan's of Constantinople (1629). A schismatic council held at Jerusalem under Dositheus, in 1672, vigorously professed its faith in the Real Presence [3] and added that the Greek Church, without being in any way influenced by the Latin, also be-

1 *Wider etliche Rotiengeistcr,* '533·

2 See the profession of faith of the Emperor Michael Palacologus (Dcniinger-Bannwart, n. 46s).

3 *Ἀληθώι καί πραγματικῶι καί οὐσιωδώί (vere, realifer et iHbitan-Haliter) γιγνόμενον· Α μίν Σπρατ αϋτΑ* rd *ἁ\γδιτ* rod Κὐριον *σώμα κτΚ·*

lieved in "Transubstantiation,"[4] a doctrine already inculcated by the Second Council of Nicæa (A. D. 787)/

It follows that the Greek Church must have received its faith in the Real Presence and in Transubstantiation from a very ancient source,— a source which it had in common with the Latin Church long before the time of Photius, and that consequently this belief must be much older than the great schism.®

2. The Period From a.d. 800 to 400.—Going still farther back we find that the Nestorians and Monophysites, who broke away from Rome in the fifth century, together with their various offshoots (Chaldæans, Melchites, Syrian Jacobites, Copts, Armenians, Maronites) preserved their faith in the Real Presence as unwaveringly as the Greeks, Bulgarians, and Russians. This proves that the dogma of the Real Presence was the common property of the undivided ancient Church. It was expressly asserted and defended by the General Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, and by the Second Ecumenical Council of Nicæa, A. D. 787J

John Darugensis, a Monophysitic writer of the eighth century, says: "He who exercises the priestly office,

« μιτονσίωσκ.

6 Cfr. E. J. Kimmel, Monum. *Fidci Eccles. Orient.,* Vol. I, pp. 180, 457. Jena 1850; Schelstratc, *Ada Orient. Eccles.,* Vol, I, pp. 200 sqq.. Rome 1739; *Perpétuité de la Foi,* Vol. I, book 12, 2nd cd.. Paris 1670. On Cyril Lucaris and his sad end, see Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. 39 sq.

e Cfr. Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* diss. 1, art. 3, J 6.

T *V. supra,* pp. a, Sq.

begins and repeats the divine words which bring forth the Body and Blood of Christ: 'This is my Body.'"* Xenajas, another Monophysite, of the sixth century, after vigorously denying that there are two persons in Christ, avers: "We receive the living body of the living God, and not the body of a mortal man, with every holy draught we drink the living blood of the Living One, and it is not the blood of a corruptible man, like unto ourselves." 9

Even Harnack is constrained to admit that "Monophysites and Orthodox have always held the same faith with regard to the Lord's Supper."10 The Nestorians, it is true, regarded the man Jesus as a person separate and distinct from the divine hypostasis of the Logos; but they believed in the Real Presence of Christ, as a moral person, in the Eucharist. Elias of Damascus says that all Oriental Christians "agree in the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ." 11

3. The Apostolic Age.—We have seen that the dogma of the Real Presence is at least as old as Nestorianism. In matter of fact it is still older, and traces of it can be found in the Apostolic age. This is evident from ancient liturgies, from representations of the Eucharist found in the Roman catacombs, and from other vestiges of its celebration in the primitive Church.

8 *Apud* Franzelin, *De Eucharistia.* p. 119.

0 Quoted by Asscmani, *Bibl. Orient.,* Vol. II. P· 39·

10 *Dogmengeschichle.* Vol. III, and ed.. p. 436.

11 Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.,* Vol. III, p. apt.

The ancient liturgies of the Mass will be duly considered in Tart III of this treatise.[12]

Among the symbols employed by the early Christians in decorating their tombs, those which relate to the Eucharist hold an important place. There is, first of all, the famous fish symbol.[13] In one of the oldest chambers of the Catacomb of St. Lucina, for instance, a floating fish, which symbolizes "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour,"[1*] carries on his back the Eucharistic elements— a basket full of bread and a glass of red wine. A commentary on this picture is furnished by the famous inscription on the *Stele* of Abercius, composed towards the close of the second century, when the Discipline of the Secret was still in force. The student will find this inscription reproduced in the original, together with an English translation, in the *Catholic Encyclopedia}*[3] We will quote but one sentence: " Faith everywhere led me forward, and everywhere provided as my food a fish of exceeding great size, and perfect, which a holy virgin drew with her hands from a fountain — and this it [faith] ever gives to its friends to eat, it having wine of great virtue, and giving it mingled with bread."

In the so-called Greek Chapel of the cemetery of St. Priscilla, at Rome, Msgr. Wilpert recently discovered the most ancient of the known representations of the Eucharist in the Catacombs. It is a fresco known as *" Fractio Panis,"* attributed to the early part of the second century. " The scene represents seven persons at table, reclining on a semi-circular divan, and is depicted

[12] *Infra,* pp. 27a sqq.

[13] Ἰχβύι.

[1*] 'lijooüs Χριστόι θ(οΰ 'Tiis Σωτήρ = ΙΧΘΤΣ. On the fish symbol v. the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* S. v.

[15] Vol. I, p. 40. Cfr. C. M. Kauf. mann, *Handbuch der christl. Archdol.* P. 230, Paderborn 1905; A. S. Barnes. *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments,* pp. 94 sqq., >33 sqq.. London 1913.

on the wall above the apse of this little underground chapel, consequently in close proximity to the place where once stood the altar. One of the banqueters is a woman. The place of honor, to the right (in *cornu dextro),* is occupied by the 'president of the Brethren' (described about 150-155 by Justin Martyr in his account of the Christian worship), *i. e.* the bishop, or a priest deputed in his place for the occasion *(Apol.,* I, xlvi). The 'president' (προ«στώ), a venerable, bearded personage, is depicted performing the function described in the z\cts of the Apostles (II, 42, 46; XX, 7) as 'breaking bread;' hence the name *'Fractio Panis' (η κλάσι τού άρτον),* appropriately given to the fresco by its discoverer." [16]

As the Eucharist was intended to be a permanent institution,[17] it was to be expected that traces of its celebration would occur in the very oldest Christian records. This expectation is realized in the *Didache,* which dates from the close of the first century, and likewise in the Acts of the Apostles. The phrase *" ministrantibus* (λατουργούντων) *autem Ulis Domino"* (Acts XIII, *2)* can hardly refer to anything else than the Eucharistic " liturgy." [18] This view is confirmed by the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where the Apostle draws a parallel between the Eucharistic banquet of the Christians and the sacrificial banquets held in honor of pagan idols, and forbids the Corinthians to take part in the latter,

18 M. M. Hassett in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. V, p. 590. The fresco is reproduced *ibid.,* p. 591. Cfr. also Jos. Wilpert, *Fractio Panis, oder die alleste Darstellung des eucharislischen Opfers in der Cappella Creca entdeckt nnd erlSutert.* Freiburg 1895; against him. J. Lidl, *Fractio Panis oder Coena Coelestisf* Treves 1903; cfr. also Wilpert. *Die Malereien der Kalahomben Roms, 2* vols.. Freiburg 1903; G. A. Weher, *Die rumisrhen Katokomben. 3rd* cd., Ratisbon 1906; F. X. Kraus. *Roma Solteranea, 3rd* ed., Freiburg 1901.

IT i Cor. XI, aj.

18 Cfr. Heb. X, 11.

lest they "be made partakers with devils.",0 "The chalice of benediction, which we bless,"[20] he says among other things, "is it not fellowship in the Blood of Christ?[21] And the bread which we break,[22] is it not fellowship in the Body of the Lord?"[23] Clearly, in St. Paul's opinion, to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ (in contradistinction to partaking of the meat sacrificed to idols) is more than a purely ideal participation in Christ, such as might be effected by faith or love ; — it is a real reception of His true Body and Blood in Holy Communion, which is the Christian sacrificial banquet. Only by interpreting the Apostle's words in this sense are we able to understand the mystical conclusion which he draws in the following verse: "For we many are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread ;"[24] that is to say: the unity of the mystic body is founded on the numerical identity of the Eucharistic bread with the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.[25]

Thus the argument from prescription carries us back to the New Testament, where the written word of God commingles with oral Tradition as in a common well-spring.[20]

Readings: — M. Haushcr, *Der hl. Paschasius Radberlus,* Mayence 1862.—.Jos. Ernst, *Die Lehre des hl. Paschasius Radberlus*

10 i Cor. X, 16-21.

20 «ὑλογούμιν, ‹· *e.* consecrate.

21 κοινωνια τοὺ αἵματοι τοὺ *Χριστού.*

22 κλὼμἵν, i. *e.,* break liturgically.

23 κοινωνία τοὺ σὼματοι τοὺ Χριστού· (i Cor. X, 16).

24 *Ικ* τοὺ ivôs ἀρτου· U Cor. X, 17)·

25 St. Paul's teaching is more fully expounded by Λ1. Schafer, *Erklarung der beiden Bricfc an die Korinther, pp.* 195 aqq., Munster 1903; cfr. also J. MacRory, *The Epistles of St. Paid to the Corinthians,* pp. 144 sqq., Dublin 1915.

20 On the whole argument of this Article cfr. H. Bruders, S. J,, *Die Perfassung der Kirche von den ersten Jahreehntcn der apostolischcn Wirksanikeit bis sum Jahre* 17s n. *Chr.,* pp. 53 e()q Mayence 1904. *

von der Eucharistie, mil bcsondcrer Riicksicht auf die Stellung des hl. Rhabanus Maurus und des Ratramnus 3U derselben, Freiburg 1896.— Aug. Nagle, *Ratramnus und die hl. Eucharistie; zugleich eine dogmatisch-historische Wiirdigung des ersten Abendmahlstreites,* Vienna 1903.— Jos. Schnitzer, *Berengar von Tours, sein Leben und seine Lehre,* 2nd ed., Stuttgart 1892.— Pohle, " Paschasius Radbcrtus, Saint," in the *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

On the teaching of the Fathers: *J. Dollinger, *Die Lehre von der Eucharistie in den ersten Jahrhundcrten,* Mayence 1826.— H. Loretz, *Die kath. Abendmahlslehre irn Lichte der vier ersten Jahrhunderte der christlichen Kirche,* Chur 1879.— I. Marquardt, .S'. *Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus Baptismi, Chrismatis, Eucharistiae Mysteriorum Interpres,* Leipsic 1882.—J. Corblet, *Histoire Dogmatique, Liturgique et Archéologique du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie,* Paris 1885.— Aug. Nâgle, *Die Eucharistielchre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus,* Freiburg 1900.— A. Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie nach den schriftlichen Quellen der vornisanischen Zeit,* Vienna 1905.—D. Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,* 2 vols., London 1909.— G. Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* St. Louis 1913.—The *New York Review,* art. ‘‘The Real Presence in the Fathers," Vol. II (1907), Nos. i and 2.— P. Pourrat, *The Teaching of the Fathers on the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist,* New York 1908.

CHAPTER II

THE TOTALITY OF THE REAL PRESENCE

There are present in the Eucharist not only the Body and Blood of Christ, but also His Soul and Divinity. This dogma has never been attacked by heretics, and we may therefore limit ourselves to a summary demonstration of it in the form of four theses.[1]

Thesis I: The Holy Eucharist really, truly, and substantially contains the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ.

This proposition embodies an article of faith.

Proof. *Ex vi verborum,* or by virtue of the consecration, that only is made present which is expressed by the words of institution, namely, the Body and Blood of Christ. But by reason of a natural concomitance *(per coneomitantiam')* there becomes simultaneously present all that which is physically inseparable from the parts just named, *viz.:* the Soul of Christ, and together with it, His whole Humanity, and, by virtue of the Hypostatic Union, also His Divinity.[2] Hence Christ is

1 Cfr. St Thoma., Summo Theol., *3a,* qu. 76. ar'· >"4- pp. 48 .qq.: Suarez, *De Euch* «lisp. SI, 8cct. 6› n .

s Cfr. Pohlc-Preuss. *Christology,*

present in the Blessed Sacrament wholly and entirely, with His Flesh and Blood, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity,—*"Christus totus in toto."* The Council of Trent defines: "If anyone denieth that in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, ... let him be anathema." [3]

a) In the same discourse in which He says: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life," [4] our Divine Lord also declares: "He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me." [5]

To eat the Flesh and Blood of Christ, therefore, is to eat Christ whole and entire. By virtue of the words of institution *(ex vi verborum)* only the Body of Christ is made present; but it is His real, living Body, hypostatically united to the Logos, with His Soul and Divinity,— Christ whole and entire. The same applies to the Precious Blood.

b) This totality of the Real Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist was the constant

3 Sees. XIII can. i: *"Si guis negaverit, in ss. Eucharistiae sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem* foid *cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi ac proinde totum Christum, . . . anathema sil."* (Detuinger-Bannwart, n. 883).

4 John VI. ss: *"Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam."*

«John VI, s8: *". . . et qui manducat me !μ4). et ipse vivet propter me."*

property of Tradition. The Fathers would have raised the charge of "sarcophagy" against anyone who would have dared to assert that in holy Communion merely the flesh or the blood of Christ is received.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem says that whoever partakes of the Eucharist becomes by that very act a "Christophoros," *i. e.* Christ-bearer. St. Cyril of Alexandria insists on the vivifying effects of the Flesh of Christ in the soul of the communicant.® St. John Damascene sums up the teaching of the Greek Fathers as follows: "Bread and wine is not the type of the Body and Blood of Christ; far from it; it is the Body itself, endowed with Divinity, for Christ did not say, 'This is the type of my Body,' but 'This is my Body.'"[7]

c) Although, absolutely speaking, it is within the power of almighty God to separate the Body, Blood, Soul, and Logos, yet they are actually inseparable because of the indissolubility of the divine and human natures in the Hypostatic Union, which is an article of faith.[8]

Note, however, that the concrete manner in which our Lord becomes present in the Eucharist depends entirely on the condition of His Body at the moment of consecration. The sacred Body may be in one of three states: the state of mortality, that of death, and the transfigured state in which it arose from the grave. When Christ

* *Afud* Migne, *P. C.,* LXX1I, 45.'·

I De Fide Orth., IV, 13 (Migne, *P. G.,* XCIV, 1147)·—Other Patristic testimonies, *supra,* Ch. I, Sect. 2, Art. 2.

8 Cfr. Pohle-Preuss, *Christoloey.* pp. 166 sqq.

consecrated at the Last Supper, He became truly and entirely present in the sacred species, but His Body was there only as a body capable of dying, and His Blood as blood capable of being shed. In case the Apostles had celebrated the Eucharist during the *triduum mortis,* during which time Christ's Body rested in the tomb, there would have been present in the Sacred Host only the bloodless, inanimate Body of Christ, and in the Chalice only the Blood separated from His Body and absorbed by the earth as it was shed,— both the Body and the Blood, however, remaining hypostatically united to His Divinity, while His Soul, which sojourned in Limbo, would have remained entirely excluded from the Eucharistic presence.[0] Since the Resurrection Christ is present in the Eucharist in the same manner in which He sitteth at the right hand of the Father in Heaven, ». *e.,* as one glorified, who " dieth no more." [10]

In the light of these considerations the totality of the Real Presence may be explained as follows. The Divinity as such, being substantially omnipresent,[11] cannot be made present by virtue of the words of consecration. Hence these words must effect a real presence of Christ's Humanity, that is to say, primarily of His Body (Flesh and Blood), for it would be absurd to convert the species into His bodyless Soul for the purpose of bodily consumption. Only the Flesh and Blood of Christ can be consumed under the appearances of bread and wine. But by reason of a natural concomitance there becomes simultaneously present with the Body all that which is physically inseparable from it, *i. e.,* the Soul, the Humanity, and,

0 Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 76 art. i, ad I.

10 Rom. \ I, 9-

11 Cfr. Pohle-Preuss. *Cod- Hit KnowabilUy, Etttnct. and .-tttributet,* pp. *311* sqq.

by virtue of the Hypostatic Union, also the Divinity, in a word — Christ whole and entire.

This twofold mode of coming into being, while not an article of faith, is part of the Church's traditional teaching and cannot be denied without great temerity and danger to the faith.[12] The Tridentine Council says: "This faith has ever been in the Church of God, that immediately after the consecration the veritable Body of our Lord and His veritable Blood, together with His Soul and Divinity, are under the species of bread and wine; but the Body indeed under the species of bread, and the Blood under the species of wine, by the force of the words; but the Body itself under the species of wine, and the Blood under the species of bread, and the Soul under both, by the force of that natural connexion and concomitance whereby the parts of Christ our Lord, who hath now risen from the dead to die no more, are united together; and the Divinity, furthermore, on account of the admirable Hypostatic Union thereof with His Body and Soul."[13] This definition represents the Hypostatic Union not as a special kind of production, side by side with that *per concomitantium,* but merely as its concrete mode in regard to the Divinity of Christ. Nevertheless, it is probable that the Council chose this expression purposely to exclude the notion that by virtue of the words of consecration the Father,

12 Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 51, «et. 3, n. i.

13 Sess. XIII, cap. 3: *"Semper haec fides* in *Ecclesia Dei fuit statim post consecrationem verum Domini* nwtn *corpus vcrumqiie* ciuc jan*guinem sub panis et vini* j/,ccie und *cum ipsius anima ct* divinitate *existere; sed corpus quidem »ub specie panis et sanguinem sub* vini *specie cx vi verborum, ipsum autem corpus sub specie vini et sanguinem sub specie panis animamque sub utraque vi naturalis illius cunnexionis ct concomitantiae, quâ partes Christi Domini, qui* ,'am *Cx mortuis resurrexit, non amplius moriturus inter se copulantur; divinitatem porro propter admirabilem illam eius cum corpore et anima hypostaticam unionem."* (Denzinger-Bannwart u. 876).

too, and the Holy Ghost, become present by concomitance. For this reason we cannot accept the opinion of those who hold that the other two Divine Persons are sacramentally present together with the Son in the Holy Eucharist Of course all three are present by virtue of the divine attribute of omnipresence, by their consubstantiality, and, more especially, by virtue of the Trinitarian Perichoresis or mutual inexistence;[14] but as only the Logos assumed flesh and blood in the Hypostatic Union, He alone can be present with flesh and blood such as the sacramental species signify.[15]

Thesis II: Christ is present whole and entire under each species.

This is also *de fide.*

Proof. The meaning is: We do not receive one part of Christ in the Sacred Host, and the other in the Chalice, as if our reception of the whole Christ depended on partaking of both species. Contrariwise, under the appearance of bread alone as well as under the appearance of wine alone we receive Christ whole and entire—*Christus totus sub alterutra specie.* This truth explains the permissibility and propriety of Communion under one kind,[18] and is an article of faith. The *Decretum pro Annenis* defines: "Christ is contained whole and entire under the

14 Cfr. Pohle-Preuss, *The Divine Trinity,* pp. 281 sqq.

IB Cfr. Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* dissert. 4, art. i, ji<b *fincm;* De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 8, sect 6, n. ia6 »qq.

18 Cfr. Sidney F. Smith. S. *J., Communion under One Kind,* London tgn, pp. *2* sqq.

species of bread, and whole and entire under the species of wine." And the Council of Trent: "It is most true that as much is contained under either species as under both." [17]

a) This dogma has its Scriptural basis in the fact that St. Paul attaches the same guilt "of the Body and the Blood of the Lord" to the unworthy eating and drinking in the disjunctive as in the copulative sense. Cfr. i Cor. XI, 27: "Whoever eateth the bread or drinketh of the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. XI, 29: "For he that eateth and drinketh without distinguishing the body [from other food], eateth and drinketh judgment to himself." [18]

The Fathers testify that the glorified Saviour is present whole and entire on our altars. The Liturgy of St. Chrysostom says: "The Lamb of God, Son of the Father, is broken but not diminished, continually eaten but not consumed."[10] Hence, wherever the glorified

Deer. pro Armcnis: "Totus Christus continetur sub specie panis, cl totus sub *specie* vini." (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 698).— Cone. Trid., Sess. XIII, cap. 3: " Quapropter verissimum est tantundem sub altemtrâ specie *atque sub utrâque contineri."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, η. 876).

ιβ t Cor. XI, 27: *"Itaque* quicunque *manducaverit . . . vel biberit (ἰσβίη . . .* rrirp) indigne, reus erit *corporis ei* sanguinis (τοὐ σὠματοι καὶ τοὐ atgaros) Domini." — i Cor. XI, 29: *" Qui enim* manducat et *bibit (ἐσθἰων καὶ πἰνων") indigne, indicium sibi manducat et bibit."*— Wc have adopted the Westminster version. For a fuller explanation of the texts quoted see Al. Schafer, *Erklarung dcr beiden Bricfc* an die *Korinther,* p. 235, Münster 1903; Jos. MacRory, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians,* pp. 176 sqq., Dublin 1915.

10 " Frangitur et *dividitur Agnus Dei, Filius Patris, qui frangitur, at non comminuitur, qui semper comeditur et non consumitur."* (Goar, *Eucholog.,* 2nd ed., p. 65.)

Body or Blood of Christ is, there is Christ whole and entire, with Body and Soul, Divinity and Humanity.[20]

b) This second thesis is substantially contained in the first.

While it is true that, by virtue of the words of consecration *(vi verborum'),* there is made present under the bread only the Body of Christ without His Blood, and under the wine only the Blood of Christ without His Body,[21] yet from the law of natural concomitance, which we explained above,[22] it follows that the glorified Body of Christ can not exist without His Blood, nor the living Body without His Soul, nor the sacred Humanity thus constituted without the Logos, with which it is hypostatically united; and consequently, Christ is present whole and entire both in the Sacred Host apart from the Chalice, and in the contents of the Chalice apart from the Sacred Host.

Thesis III: When the Sacred Host is broken into pieces, or the consecrated contents of the Chalice are consumed in small quantities, Christ is wholly and entirely present in each particle and in every drop.

This proposition likewise embodies an article of faith.

Proof. The *Decretum pro Armenis* says: "Christ is entirely present in every particle of the consecrated Host and of the consecrated

20 A number of other Patristic passages bearing on this point will be found *infra.* Part II. Ch. I, Sect. *3,* Art. 3.— See also *J.* Hoffmann. *Die Laicnkommunion bis sum Tridentinum.* Spires 1891.

21 Body and Blood form a contrast of considerable importance in regard to the Sacrifice of the Maas. *V. infra,* Part. III.

23 Thesis I,

wine, when separated *(separatione facta),"* that is to say, when the Host is broken into particles or the wine consumed in small quantities.[23] The Council of Trent defines: "If anyone denieth that in the venerable Sacrament of the Eucharist the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated, let him be anathema." [24]

a) It is improbable that Christ at the Last Supper consecrated separately each particle of the bread He had broken. The contents of the Chalice He gave entire to His disciples, to be partaken of distributively. Matth. XXVI, 27: "Taking the chalice, He gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this." Mark XIV, 23: "And they all drank of it."

b) The teaching of Tradition is evident from the utterances of the Fathers and the liturgical practice of the Church.

It is only on the basis of the Tridentine dogma that we can understand why St. Cyril of Jerusalem warned communicants to be scrupulously careful in conveying the Sacred Host to their mouths. "After thou hast sanctified thine eyes by contact with the sacred Body," he says, "in proceeding to partake of it, beware lest some particle fall to the ground, I'or that which perishes thou shalt regard

23 *Decret, pro Armenii: "Sub qualibet quoque parte hostiae consecratae et* vini consecrati *separatione foeti totus est Christus."* (Dcnzinger-Bannwart. n. 698).

2* Sess. XIII, can. 3: "Si quis negaverit in *venerabili sacramento Eucharistiae sub unaquaque specie et* sub *singulis cuiusque speciei partibus separatione facti totum Christum contineri, anathema* sil." (Denzinger Bannwart, n. 885).

as if thou hadst lost one of thine own members. If some one had presented thee with gold coins, wouldst thou not preserve them with the greatest care, lest they be lost? With how much greater caution shouldst thou see to it that not even a crumb is lost of that which is far more precious than gold or jewels.''25 The Pseudo-Dionysius writes: "When [the priest] breaks the indivisible bread into many parts,20 and distributes the entire contents of the chalice among all,27 he symbolically multiplies and distributes merely the oneness.''28 St. Cæsarius of Arles (4- 542) teaches: "The Body dispensed by the priest is as much in each particle as it is in the whole. . . . Each single recipient obtains nothing less than all [obtain] together: one has the whole, two have the whole, many receive the whole without diminution.''29 Eutychius, Patriarch of Byzantium (+ 582), writes: "Each [communicant] receives the whole sacred Body and precious Blood of the Lord, even though he is given but a part thereof;30 for it divides itself31 undivided32 among all." 83

The same truth is expressed even more clearly in the ancient liturgies. Thus we read in the Syrian rite: ''It is Christ our Lord who, for the forgiveness of sins and unto eternal life, is broken and not divided,34 distributed to the faithful and not consumed." The Church has always permitted fragments of the Sacred Host to be

25 *Catech. Mystag.,* V, n. 21.

20 tts πολλά δ<ίλώρ·

27 πάσι καταμέρισα.*

-'β *την ενότητα ττΧηθϋνει καί διαμένει· (De Eccl. Hier.,* c. *3,*

20 *Hom.,* 5: *"Corpus sacerdote dispensante tantum est in exiguo, quantum esse constat* i» *toto. . . . Nihil minus habent singuli quam universi: totum unus, lotum duo, totum plures sine diminutions percipiunt."* (Migne, *P. L.,* LXVII, >054).

so a-Hp *el με'ρο* τούτων δέζηταν* si *μερίζεται·*

32 *άμερΐστωί-*

33 *Senn. de Pasch.,* n. *j.*

3* ὁ *μελιζόμενοί καί μη μεριζόμβνος·*

given in Holy Communion, and at one time allowed the faithful to partake of the precious Blood from one and the same chalice."

Thesis IV: Even before the actual division of the sacred species Christ is wholly and entirely present in each particle of the Host and in each drop of the collective contents of the Chalice.

Unlike the three preceding theses, this one embodies merely a theological conclusion.

Proof. A few older Scholastic theologians, notably William of Auxerre[36] and Albertus Magnus,[37] denied this conclusion. They contended that, as an unbroken mirror shows forth but one image of the sun, whilst a broken one reflects as many as there are fragments of glass, so Christ is wholly and entirely present in the fragments of the sacred Host only when it is broken after the consecration.

Dominicus Soto claims that this opinion is heretical. But if it were, the Tridentine Council would not have added to its definition, quoted above, the phrase "*separatione facta.*"[36] Nevertheless our thesis can only claim the value of a theological conclusion, though Vasquez, Suarez, and De Lugo insist that it may not be rejected without error?[0] That the Council of Trent did not mean to favor the opposing view when it adopted the

86 Cfr. the hymn "*Lauda Sion.*"

so Summa, P. 4, tr. 5, c. 4.

87 Comment, in Sent., IV, dist. 13, art it.

88 Supra, Thesis III.

ao Sententia erronea *vel* errori *proxima,*

words *"separatione factâ,"* is apparent from its preliminary debates on the subject,[40] and from the noteworthy circumstance that the phrase *"separatione factà"* does not appear in Chapter III of Sessio XIII, which reads: " Wherefore it is most true that as much is contained under either species as under both; for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread and under any part whatsoever of that species [here the restrictive clause *separatione factâ* is omitted] ; likewise the whole [Christ] is under the species of wine and under the parts thereof."[41]

a) The whole Body of Christ, and consequently Christ in His entirety, is present wherever the substance of bread was present before the consecration, because Transubstantiation changes the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body. Now, the substance of the bread before consecration is present not only in the totality of the host, but in every one of its parts, whether separated or united. Consequently, the whole Body of Christ, *i. e.* Christ whole and entire, is present in each particle of the host even before it is broken. The same reasoning applies to the wine.

This positive argument can be strengthened by a negative one. If Christ were not present en-

40 Cfr. Pallavicini, *Hist. Cone. Trident.,* Vol. XII, 7, 7.

«1 Sees. XIII, cap. 3: *"Quapropter verissimum est, tantundem sub alterutra specie atque sub utrâque contineri; totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie et sub quavis ipsius speciei parte, totus idem sub vini specie et sub eius partibus esistil."* (DcniingerBannwart, n. 876).

tirely in every single particle of the Eucharistic species, even before their division, we should be forced to conclude that it is the process of dividing the species which effects the totality of His presence, whereas the Church plainly teaches that the sole operative cause of the real and total Presence is Transubstantiation.·*2

b) This last conclusion directs the attention of the philosophic enquirer to a mode of existence which is peculiar to the Eucharistic Body, though contrary to the ordinary laws of nature.

The Body of Christ is present under the Eucharistic species, not after the manner of material bodies, but after the manner of spirits. This truth was well known to the ancient Fathers. Thus St. Ambrose says: "The body of God is a spiritual body." 4[2] Reserving the speculative discussion of this mystery for a later chapter,[41] we here confine ourselves to a brief explanation.

The Body of Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist in much the same way as the human soul is present in the body.

(1) As the spiritual soul dwells in the whole body, so the Eucharistic body of our Lord is present in the sacred host as a whole.

(2) As the spiritual soul dwells in every part of the body with the whole of its substance, so the whole Body of Christ is present in the sacred species, not merely in their totality, but in every particle thereof.

42 Cfr. Suarez, *De* Euc/iaristia, disp. 52, sect. 2; De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 8, sect 3.

48 *De Myst.,* IX, 58 (Migne, *P. L.,* XVI, 408): *"Corfus Dei corfus est sfirituale."*

44 *V. infra,* Ch. V, pp. 143 sqq.

(3) As the presence of the soul in all the members of the body does not result in a multiplicity of separate and distinct presences, so neither is the Eucharistic presence of the Body in the sacred species limited to the continuous (as yet unbroken) species as a whole, whereas before the division of the species it is present in the different particles only inadequately.

This third analogy will help to clear away a difficulty arising from the infinite divisibility of material substances.

It would be foolish to say that the Body of Christ is present in the undivided host as many times as the host is capable of being broken into separate particles. Neither has the human soul as many lives or existences in the body as the body has members animated by the soul. For the soul has only one adequate mode of being in relation to the whole body, and a number of inadequate modes in relation to its various members. Thus the Body of Christ is adequately present but once in the whole of the Sacred Host, inadequately, however, many times in its different parts. "Number follows division," says St. Thomas, "and therefore so long as quantity remains actually undivided, neither is the substance of anything several times under its proper dimensions, nor is Christ's Body several times under the dimensions of the bread; and consequently not an infinite number of times, but just as many times as it is [actually] divided into parts."[46]

46 *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 76, art. 3. ad 1: *"Numerus sequitur divisionem et ideo, quamdiu quantitas manet indivisa actu, neque substantia alicuius rei est pluries sub dimensionibus propriis neque corpus Christi sub dimensionibus panis. Et per consequens neque infinities, sed toties in quot partes [actu] dividitur."*

CHAPTER III

TRANSUBSTANTIATION, OR THE OPERATIVE CAUSE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

We have seen *how* Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist. The question arises: What causes His presence? The answer is: Transubstantiation.

We shall first explain the nature of Transubstantiation and the history of the term in Catholic theology (Sect, i), and then prove the dogmatic teaching of the Church in regard to this mystery from Scripture and Tradition (Sect. 2).

SECTION I

DEFINITION OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION

To arrive at a correct idea of the nature of Transubstantiation, we must first examine the underlying notions of change and conversion.

I. Conversion.—A change *(mutatio, àxxoL ωσ«—motus, κίνησση)* js a transition from one state to another. Conversion *(conversio, ilcTaβολη)* is something more than that. It is a "transition of one thing into another thing in some aspect of being." [1]

a) In a mere change, one of the two extremes may be expressed negatively. Conversion, on the other hand, requires two positive extremes, each of which must be related to the other as thing to thing, and they must have so intimate a connexion with each other that the last extreme *(terminus ad quem)* begins to exist only as the first *(terminus a quo)* ceases.

If a change affects the substance of a thing (as in the metabolic processes of the human body) it is called *substantial;* if merely its accidents (as when water turns into ice, or a block of marble is fashioned into a statue), it is called *accidental.* If a change falls within the ordinary laws of human experience, it is *natural;* if it tran-

1 *Conversio est transitus unius rei in aliam sub a/u/uJ ratione entis.*

scends these laws, as *e. g.* the conversion of water into wine wrought by our Saviour at Cana, it is *supernatural.*

b) Conversion, being a "transition of one thing into another thing in some aspect of being," requires two objects: that which is changed *(terminus a quo)* and that into which it is changed *(terminus ad quem).* It further requires an intrinsic connexion between the disappearance of the one and the appearance of the other, and generally also a third element, known as the *commune tertium,* which, even after the conversion has taken place, unites the two extremes with each other.

a) Every conversion must have two extremes, for a thing cannot be converted into itself. What is sometimes called "reconversion" is, generally speaking, either a mere change in the sense of a return to a previously existing state (as in the regular alternation of day and night) or a true conversion with two distinct extremes (as in some chemical processes).

β) In every conversion there must be an intrinsic connexion between the disappearance of the one extreme and the appearance of the other, because a conversion is effected not by two independent and unconnected acts, but by one and the same act which causes the *terminus a quo* to cease to exist and calls the *terminus ad quem* into being, in such a way that the one is the cause of the other. This intrinsic connexion may be either physical or moral.

y) There is further required a common element that unites the two extremes (connmoie *tertium').* In every true conversion this condition must be fulfilled: "What

was formerly A is now B." The question immediately arises: Must this common element be something physical and real, as when food is converted into living tissue, or may it be a mere *ens rationis?* On this point Catholic theologians disagree. Suarez[2] and De Lugo[3] insist that it must be a physical reality, whereas others hold with Pallavicini[4] that the continued existence of the logical relations between the two terms is sufficient, because otherwise it would be difficult to see what physical reality could have been left behind as *tertium commune, e. g.* in the conversion by Moses of a rod into a serpent. Whilst this is true enough, Franzelin[6] is undoubtedly right in saying, on the other hand, that the continued existence of a common physical reality is a *conditio sine qua non* of conversion in the complete sense of the term.

c) Two important questions here suggest themselves: (I) Must there be a relation of contrary opposition between the two extremes of a conversion? and (2) Must the last extreme have been previously non-existent?

(1) There need not necessarily be a relation of contrary opposition between the two extremes, because a conversion, properly speaking, is not effected by virtue of extremes that mutually exclude each other, as *e. g.* love excludes hate, heat excludes cold, etc., but merely requires two positive extremes, while in case of contrary opposition one extreme must always be negative, or at least privative.

(2) The second question amounts to this: Can an ex-

2 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 50, sect. 2, n. >6.

3 *De Eucharistia,* diep. *7, sect* 1.

4 *Curs. Theol.,* VI, 19, 257.

6 *De Eucharistia,* the». «3.

isting *terminus a quo* be converted into an existing *terminus ad quem?* This is not so easy to answer. In the miracle of Cana, for instance, was the wine necessarily a new creation, and was the water irrevocably gone? Indeed, if the act of conversion is not to be a mere process of substitution, as in sleight-of-hand performances, the *terminus ad quern* must unquestionably in some manner begin to exist just as the *terminus a quo* must in some manner really cease to exist. On this point all theologians are unanimous. The deeper question is: Does the production of the *terminus ad quern* require a new creation, strictly so called, or is the idea of conversion fully realized when a thing which already exists in substance merely acquires a new mode of being? A careful consideration will show that the last-mentioned requirement is quite sufficient, and that it is not necessary to postulate the previous non-existence of the *terminus ad quern.* Our Lord assures His disciples: "God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham."β Were these children pre-existent? Assuming (a false though not impossible assumption) that the souls of men exist before they are united with their bodies, would the idea of conversion be realized if an already existing soul, as *terminus ad quern, were* to enter into a corpse and animate it as its substantial form? In the resurrection, the long decayed bodies of the dead will be truly converted into bodies of the risen by their previously existing souls, just as at death they were truly converted into corpses by the departure of these souls. Hence the disappearance of the *terminus a quo* need not spell annihilation, nor is the appearance of the *terminus ad quern* necessarily equivalent to creation, but it is sufficient that the former extreme

e Maith, in, 9.

cease and the latter begin to exist merely in a certain respect *(secundum quid).*

In either extreme of a conversion theologians further distinguish a twofold term: the *terminus totalis* and the *terminus formalis.* If we call the thing itself *which* disappears or comes into existence, the *terminus totalis,* and the same thing *in so far as* it disappears or ceases to exist, the *terminus formalis,* it is manifest that the *terminus formalis a quo* must disappear in every true conversion ; but it does not follow that the *terminus totalis a quo* must entirely cease to exist. All that is required is that it simply cease to exist in some respect *(secundum quid).* In matter of fact its place is taken by the *terminus totalis ad quern.* This need not, however, involve the *terminus formalis ad quern,* which may have existed previously.

2. Substantial Conversion.—A substantial conversion *(conversio substantialis,* μιτονσίωσι) is that species of change by which one substance becomes another substance.

This definition excludes all merely accidental conversions, whether natural or supernatural.

A substantial conversion is either *total* or *partial,* according as it affects the whole substance of a thing or only an essential part thereof. A *conversio substantialis totalis,* in the Aristotelian sense, is a transition of the entire substance of a material thing, both as to matter and form, into the substance of another. A *conversio substantialis partialis* is a transition of either the matter or the form of a composite thing into that of another. The former is called *conversio materialis,* the latter *conversio-formalis.* Were my body, for example, suddenly

converted into a new body, the soul remaining unchanged, this would be a *conversio materialis.* The *conversio formalis* effects a conversion of the substantial form only and leaves the protyle *(materia prima)* unchanged. Both kinds of conversion are rightly called substantial because they affect the substance of things. The circumstance that they are merely partial must not lead us to confound them, or put them on the same level, with merely accidental conversions, which change only the external form of material things *(e. g.* the metamorphosis of insects, the transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor).

Transubstantiation differs from all other species of substantial conversion in this, that the substance is converted into another substance, while the accidents remain unchanged. Thus, if wood were miraculously converted into iron and the substance of the latter remained hidden under the appearance of the former, we should have a true transubstantiation.

3. Transubstantiation.—The change that takes place in the Eucharist is precisely such a conversion of one substance into another. The Council of Trent defines "that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called Transubstantiation."[1]

[1] Sess. XIII, cap. 4: "Sancta hacc Synodus dcc/arat, *fcr const·* cralionem funis et vini conversionem fieri totiu* eubjtanliae *fanis in* jiib- *stanliam corforis Christi Domini* nostri et *totius substantiae vini in*

a) In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we have a true conversion.

There are, first, the two extremes of bread and wine as the *terminus a quo,* and the Body and Blood of Christ as the *terminus ad quern.* There is, secondly, an intimate connexion between the cessation of one extreme and the appearance of the other, in that both events result not from two independent processes (as *e. g.* annihilation and creation), but from one single act. At the words of consecration the substance of the bread and wine vanishes to make room for the Body and Blood of Christ. Lastly, there is a *commune tertium* in the unchanged appearances of the *terminus a quo.* Christ in assuming a new mode of being, retains these appearances, in order to enable us to partake of His Body and Blood. The *terminus totalis a quo* is not annihilated, because the appearances of bread and wine continue. What disappears is the substance of bread and wine, which constitutes the *terminus formalis a quo.* Nor can the *terminus totalis ad quern* be said to be newly created, because the Body and Blood of Christ, and in fact the whole Christ, as *terminus formalis ad quern,* pre-exist both in His Divinity (from all eternity), and in His Humanity (since the Incarnation). What begins to exist anew in the *terminus ad quern* is not our Lord as such, but merely a sacramental mode of being, in other words, the " Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

b) The Tridentine Council defines that "the total substance of the bread and of the wine is

substantiam sanguinis eius, quae conversa convenienter et proprie a sancta catholica Ecclesia transsubstantialia est appellata." (Denzinger-Dannwart, n. 877).

converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of our Lord," and hence Transubstantiation is a *conversio substantialis totalis,* as explained above.[8]

This fact raises Transubstantiation far above all other species of conversion, and, in conjunction with certain other qualities yet to be mentioned, places it in a category of its own.

a) All other conversions with which we are familiar are merely partial, affecting either the matter or the form. Transubstantiation alone affects both matter and form, *i. e.* the total substance of the Eucharistic elements.

β) In no other kind of conversion do the accidents remain as *commune tertium,* whereas in the Eucharist, after Transubstantiation, the true Body and Blood of Christ exist under the appearances of bread and wine in such a manner that the relation of inherence is entirely suspended and the Eucharistic Christ is not degraded to the level of a *subjectuni inhaesionis for* the accidents of bread and wine.

γ) In every merely natural conversion the change takes place gradually, in proportion as the subject becomes disposed or fit to receive its new form, whereas the Transubstantiation of bread and wine in the Eucharist is effected in an instant.

These considerations show that Transubstantiation is a supernatural and altogether miraculous process, which must remain a mystery to the human mind."

c) The term "Transubstantiation," applied to this unique conversion, is very appropriate, as it

8 V. *supra,* No. 2. Cfr. Cone. 1nd., bess. XIII, can. *li* a: ·· . . . mirabilem *illam et singularcin* convcreionem."

etymologically includes the notion of a total and substantial change and excludes that of a merely accidental conversion. For while the substance of bread and wine is converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, the accidents remain unchanged.

The word "Transubstantiation" was unknown to the ancient Fathers, but it is so accurately descriptive of the conversion that takes place in the Holy Eucharist, and forms so powerful a bulwark of the true faith against heresies, that the Church has adopted it into her theological terminology. Hildebert of Tours (about 1097),[10] a vigorous opponent of Berengarius,[11] seems to have been the first writer to employ the word. His example was followed by Stephen of Autun (-f- 1139), Gaufred (1188), Peter of Blois (-]- about 1200), Alanus of Lille (-|- 1203), and others, and by several ecumenical councils, notably the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) [12] and that of Lyons (1274)." It was finally stamped with official approval at Trent. Suarez is therefore right in saying that to reject this term as " inappropriate or barbarous " would be foolhardy and offensive, and would incur the suspicion of heresy.[13][14]

The Greek schismatic Church adopted the equivalent

10 *Semi.,* 93: *" verbum transsubstantiaiionis."*

11 On Berengarius, see Ch. I, Sect

12 *Cap. "Firmiter": " transsubslantiatis pane in corpus el vino in sanguinem."* (Denzinger-Bannwart,

13 *Confessio Fidei Mich. Palaeologi: "Panis vere transsubstantiatur in corpus el vinum in sanguinem."* (Dcnzingcr-Bannwart. n. 465)·

14 *Cone. Trid.,* Sess. XIII, cap. 4, can. 2.— Suarez. *De Each.,* disp. 50, sect i, n. s-' *" A 1"» I · · vocem transsubstantiatioms abiicerei ut ineptam et barbaram, in re ipsd non esistimo esse haereticum, quia usus vocis per se non pertinet ad obiectum fidei, esset tomen valde temerarius, scandolosus et pias aures offenderet ac denique* in *esterno foro esset vehementer de hasresi suspectus."*

term *μίτονσίωσι·:* (in the sense of *μεταβολή οὔσιω8η^)* into her official terminology in 1643.*®

4. The Dogmatic Bearing of Transubstantiation.—Transubstantiation virtually includes the Real Presence, because the substantial conversion which takes place in the Eucharist results in the Body and Blood of Christ. But it would not be true to say, conversely, that Transubstantiation is contained in the dogma of the Real Presence.

The dogma of Transubstantiation comprises three separate and distinct heads of doctrine, to wit:

(1) that Christ is really and truly present under the appearances of bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist;

(2) that, though the accidents of bread and wine continue, the respective substances no longer exist; and

(3) that both these changes are produced by virtue of a substantial conversion.

Taken in the order in which we have enumerated them, these doctrines postulate and presuppose one another. Not so, however, if the order be inverted. One might believe in the Real Pres-

15 Cfr. Deniflc, *Luther* «nd Lu· *thertum* in *der ersten Enlwicktung,* Vol. I, ind cd., pp. 614 sqq., Mayence 1906; Gilhnann, *"Zur Geschichte de.· Gcbrauchs der Ausdriickc iraussubilantiare und transsubstantiatio.·'* in the Mayence *Kathohk,* 1908, II, pp. 4,7 Sqq.

cncc without admitting that the substances of bread and wine are totally absent, while, conversely, if one believed in the latter doctrine, one could not consistently deny the former. Again, one might hold the dogma of the Real Presence, yet deny that the bread and wine which have undergone a true transubstantiation are entirely absent after the consecration.

Transubstantiation furnishes a sure criterion for discerning erroneous teachings with regard to the Holy Eucharist. Take, *e. g.,* Consubstantiation. Luther held that the bread and wine remain bread and wine, though after the consecration the real Flesh and Blood of Christ co-exist in and with the natural elements, just as an iron bar still remains an iron bar, though a new element, heat, has come to co-exist in and with it'' This theory is clearly incompatible with Transubstantiation because it implies the continued presence of the substances of bread and wine. Equally incompatible with the dogma as held by the Church, is the isolated view of Durandus (4- 1332) that the substantial form of the bread alone undergoes conversion, while the primary matter *(materia prima, ϋλη πρώτη)* remains unchanged.17 Being a conversion of the total substance, Transubstantiation involves the conversion of the matter of the bread as well as of its form, thus obviating the absurd corollary of Durandus that the Body of Christ experiences a material increase at each consecration.18 The dogma of Transubstantiation

10 Luther himself uses this illustration in a letter to Henry VIII. Sec tlso Herzog's *Rcalcnsyklopàdie der frot. Théologie,* and cd.. Vol. XV, 829 *{The New Schaff-Hcroog Encyclopedia of Religione Knowledge.* Vol. III, p. 260).

IT Durandus. *Comment. in Sent.,* IV, dist. 11. qu. 3.

ia This corollary was espoused by

is likewise incompatible with the theory that the Real Presence involves a hypostatic union between the substance of the bread and the God-man. This theory was attributed by Bellarmine and Vasquez to Abbot Rupert of Deutz (+ 1135), but it probably originated among the adherents of Berengarius in the eleventh century. Osiander advocated it in the sixteenth century under the name of "Impanation" *(impanatio, ἐναρτισμός, Deus panis foetus').* The substantial conversion that takes place in the Holy Eucharist cannot be a hypostatic union for the simple reason that a process which would convert God into a created substance could not be called by that term without completely changing its meaning. In a somewhat modified form the Impanation theory was held by John of Paris at the beginning of the fourteenth century. This writer taught that there is a hypostatic union between the substance of the bread and the God-man, but that it affects immediately only the Body of Christ, so that it would be correct to say, by virtue of the communication of idioms, "This bread is the Body of Christ," but false to say, "God is bread," inasmuch as God enters into a hypostatic union with the substance of the bread only in a mediate manner, *i. e.* through the instrumentality of His Body. But it is manifestly absurd to assume that an impersonal substance like bread can be hypostatically supported by the Body of Christ. The Impanation theory in all its forms furthermore errs in assuming the continued existence of the bread in the Holy Eucharist. As a matter of fact the total substance of the bread is converted into the Body of Christ, and consc-

Rosmini anil condemned by the Church. (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 1919). *V. Annales de Philosophie CMlicnnc,* May, 1901; cfr G van Noort, *De Sacramentis* Vol I 2nd .ed,, p. 276, Amsterdam >910 '

quently, there is no substance left with which the God-man could enter into a hypostatic union.[10]

10 Related to this theory is that of the well-known Jesuit Father Joseph Bayma (+ 1892 at Santa Clara, Cal.; see the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. II. p. 360), censured by the Holy Office July 7, 1875 (" *tolerari non posse,"* Dcnzinger· Bannwart, n. 1843 sqq.). Cfr. Franzelin, *De Eueh.,* thes. 15, seholion.— On the dogmatic implications of Transubstantiation the student may profitably consult Heinricb-Gutberlet, *Dogniatische Théologie,* VoL IX, I S3».

SECTION 2

TRANSUBSTANTIATION PROVED FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

i. Various Heretical Errors vs. the Teaching of the Church.—On three different occasions the Church found it necessary to define her teaching in regard to Transubstantiation; —first, against Berengarius ; second, against Martin Luther, and third, against the Jansenistic Council of Pistoia.

a) Berengarius of Tours,[1] who flourished towards the middle of the eleventh century, denied the dogma of Transubstantiation and probably also that of the Real Presence. His famous treatise *De Sacra Coena* contains the following passage: *"Panis consecratus in altari amisit vilitatem, amisit inetficaciam, non amisit* naturae *proprietatem."* Among his adherents there was much confusion. While they were unanimous in denying Transubstantiation, they differed widely in other respects. Some held that the Eucharist merely contains an image of the Body of Christ ; others believed in a sort of " Impanation." Others, again, more nearly approaching the Catholic doctrine, admitted a partial conversion of the bread and wine, while still others maintained that the Body and Blood of our Lord are really and truly

1 V. l«pra, pp. 47 sq.

present in the Eucharist, but become reconverted into bread and wine when received by the wicked.[2]

Luther, adhering to belief in the Real Presence, rejected Transubstantiation as "a sophistic subtlety" and taught in its place what is known as "Consubstantiation."[3] In their endeavor to explain how two substances arc able to co-exist in the same place, the Lutherans split into two camps. Osiander revived "Impanation,"[4] whereas Luther himself, to escape the difficulties urged against his position, had recourse to the famous theory of "Ubiquitarianism."[5]

The Jansenistic Council of Pistoia (1786) advised the clergy to confine themselves in their preaching to the dogma of the Real Presence and to ignore Transubstantiation as a "scholastic quibble."[6]

The unbending opposition of the Church to all these vagaries shows that she considers the doctrine of Transubstantiation intimately bound up with that of the Real Presence.

We have already mentioned the profession of faith to which Berengarius was compelled to subscribe at the Roman Council of 1097. The Council of Trent defined against Luther and his followers: "If anyone saith that, in the sacred and holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the sub-

2 Hergenrother, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. II, 4th ed., p. 417, Freiburg 1904.

3 IΛ *eupra,* pp. 49, 113.

4 F. *lupra,* pp. 113 sqq.

6 The absurdity of the Impanation theory is effectively shown by Hurter, *Compendium Theol. Dogmat.*. Vol. III, 12th ed., n. 440. Innsbruck 1909. On Luther's " Ubiquitarianism " *see* Pohle-Preuss, *Clirùtology,* pp. 194 sqq.

0 Cfr. Hergenrother. *Kirehcngeichichte,* VoL III, 4th ed., pp. 6a8 sqq.. Freiburg 1909.

stance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood — the species only of the bread and wine remaining,—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema."[7]

The abortive attempt of the Synod of Pistoia to misrepresent the dogma thus solemnly proclaimed by the Church, was condemned by Pope Pius VI in his Bull *"Auctorem Fidei,"* A.D. 1794.[8]

The Tridentine definition states the Catholic belief in Transubstantiation so clearly that nothing remains for us to do but to show that the dogma has a solid basis in Scripture and Tradition.

2. The Teaching of Sacred Scripture.—The doctrine of Transubstantiation is virtually

l Cone. Trid., Sess. XIII, can, 2: " Si quis dixerit, in ss. *Eucharistiae sacramento remanere substantiam fanis et vini uni cum corpore el sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque* mirabilem illam *et singularem conversionem totius substantiae fanis* in *corpus et talius substantiae vini* in sanguinem, manentibus dumtaxat *speciebus fanis et* vini — quam quidem conversionem *catholico Ecclesia* aptissime fronssubstantialiorem appellat, anathema sil." (Dcniinger-Bannwart. n. 884).—On the dogmatic bearing of this definition *v. sufra,* Section 1, No. 4, pp. s12 sqq.

8 *" Quatenus fer inconsultam isliusmodi susficiosamque omissionem notitia subtrahitur tum articuli ad fidem perlinentis Ium etiam vocis ab Ecclesia consecratae ad illius tuendam professionem adversus hacreses, tendiique adeo ad* eius *oblivionem inducendam, quasi ageretur de quaestione mere scholastici: perniciosa, derogans expositioni veritatis catholicae circa dogma transsubstaniiatioisis, favens haereticis."* (Denzinger-Bannwart,

contained in the words by which our Lord instituted the Blessed Sacrament: "This is my Body," etc. In the mouth of Him who is Truth itself these words cannot possibly be false. When the God-man said of the bread, "This is my Body," the bread forthwith became really and truly His Body; which can only mean that, at the completion of the sentence, the substance of the bread was gone and there was present the Body of Christ under the outward appearance of bread.

Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus, Pierre d'Ailly, and a few other Scholastic writers contend that the words of institution alone, taken literally and without regard to their traditional interpretation, do not strictly prove the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Vasquez® declares that, since the Tridentine definition, this view is no longer tenable. The most that can be said is that Transubstantiation cannot be as conclusively deduced from the words of institution as the dogma of the Real Presence. Though the manner in which the presence of the Body of Christ is effected in the Holy Eucharist may be logically deduced, it is not perhaps strictly demonstrable from the sacred text. The interpretation of that text by the Fathers, as officially confirmed by the Church, remains the only conclusive argument. Nevertheless, it is perfectly proper to conclude from the words of institution that if the bread is no longer present after the consecration, it must have become the Body of Christ by a substantial conversion.10

o *Comment, in Sent.,* HI. disp. ,go r ,

ıó Because the substance of the *>"ad and wine doe» not remain in the Eucharist, «orne, dremm» it impossible for the substance of the

The Calvinists, therefore, arc consistent in rejecting the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation as unscriptural. Had Christ intended to assert that Ilis P.ody coexists with the substance of the bread, He would surely have employed some such expression as, " This bread is my Body," or, "This bread contains my Body," or, " In this bread is *finest, Iveanv)* my Body," or, " Here is my Body."[11] In matter of fact, however, He employed the indefinite phrase τούτο, instead of the definite ούτο (t, *c., à* ἀρτο) *tari το σώμά μου,*— thereby clearly indicating that what He held in His hands after the consecration was no longer bread but His own Body. The copula *Ιστίν* between τούτο and *σώμά μου* manifestly expresses the identity of the two. Had our Lord desired to make bread merely the sacramental receptacle of His Body, as the Lutherans allege, it would have been necessary for Him to state this expressly, for neither in the nature of the case nor according to common parlance can a piece of bread become the receptacle of a human body. On the other hand, the. synedoche is plain in the case of the Chalice: "This is my Blood," *i. e.,* the contents of the Chalice are my Blood, and hence no longer wine.

3. The Teaching of Tradition.—The Fathers inculcated the dogma of Transubstantiation conjointly with that of the Real Presence, though complete clearness on the subject was not attained until the fourth century.

bread and wine to be changed into Christ's Flesh and Blood, have maintained that by the consecration the substance of the bread and wino is cither dissolved into the original matter, or that it is annihilated. St. Thomas briefly disproves both these assumptions in the Λvιιηo *Theologi-*C°\^: qu· 75. art. 3.

Ti.L.1 Γ' St- Thomas, Su»i»ia Theo1- 3a. qU. 751 nrt. 21

a) Hence the Patristic argument for the Real Presence also proves the dogma of Transubstantiation.[12]

The belief of the early Greek Fathers in Transubstantiation is apparent from the terms they employ in speaking of the conversion of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord. Here are some of them: *μεταβάλλειν* (Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodoret), *μεταστοιχειοϋν, i. e. transelementare* (Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom), *μεταποιεϊν, i. e. transferre* (Cyril of Alexandria, John of Damascus), *μεταρρυθμίζει* (Chrysostom), etc.[13] Indirectly the Fathers express their belief in Transubstantiation whenever they deny, as they often do, that the bread and the wine continue to exist as independent substances after the consecration, or affirm that the *terminus ad quem* of the conversion that takes place in the Eucharist is the true Body and Blood of Christ. Thus St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: *Μεταβάλλεται και ουκετι άρτο* . St Ambrose: *"Species elementorum mutatur."* Cyril of Alexandria declares that the bread is changed into the true Body of Christ; Chrysostom, that it becomes His crucified Body; Ambrose, that it is converted into the Body born of the Virgin Mary.

Dr. Pusey, who denied the cogency of the Patristic argument for Transubstantiation,[14] was victoriously refuted by Cardinal Franzelin.[15]

12 *V. supra,* pp. $5 sqq.— Cfr. Bellarniinc, *De Eucharistia,* III, 20.

13 The Latin Fathers usually prefer such simpler verbs as *rnillare* (St. Ambrose), *fieri* (St. Augustine), etc.

14 Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers,* Oxford 185s.

16 De Eucharistia, thes. 14, PP-IPS sqq·· Rome 1887: cfr. also Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* pp. 25 sqq·. St. Louis ipij.

b) The argument from the Fathers is strikingly confirmed by the ancient liturgies, which date in substance from the Apostolic age.

The so-called Liturgy of St. Chrysostom contains this beautiful prayer: "Send down Thy Spirit upon us and these Thy gifts [i. *e.* the Eucharistic elements], make this bread into the precious Body of Thy Christ. (Deacon: Amen). But that which is in the Chalice make into the precious Blood of Thy Christ (Deacon: Amen), converting it (/κταβαλὼν) through Thy Holy Spirit (Deacon thrice: Amen). . . . The Lamb of God, the Son of the Father, is broken and divided — broken but not diminished, everlastingly eaten but not annihilated, sanctifying those who partake thereof." [10] The following invocation is from the Liturgy of St. Basil: "Make this bread into the precious Body of our Lord and God and Redeemer Jesus Christ, and this chalice into the Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, which was shed for the life of the world." [17] In the Armenian Liturgy we read: "Consecrate this bread and wine into the true Body and the true Blood of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ, changing *{permutans}* it through Thy Holy Spirit."[18] The Mass formularies of the Western Church are equally expressive. The ancient Gothic liturgy says: "This is the Lamb of God, which, being sacrificed, never dies, but, though slaughtered, lives everlastingly. . . . May the Paraclete descend, that we may partake of the sacrificial gift in heavenly conversion, and that, after the consecration of

10 Goar, *Euchologia,* pp. 77, 81.

11 Goar, op. *tit.,* p. 169.

1R/1pud Daniel, *Codex* Liturg., IV, 465, Leipzig 18$J". *" Consecra hunc panem cl vinum* i» *verum corpus cl* verum eanguinem *Domini ct Re-*•ani Spinlu Sancto CArwh /- ""›". *luo."*

the fruit [bread] into the Body, and of the chalice into the Blood, it may conduce to our salvation." An ancient Gallican Missal contains the following prayer: "May the fulness of Thy Majesty, O Lord, . . . descend upon this bread and upon this chalice, and may [it] become unto us the legitimate Eucharist in the transformation of the Body and Blood of the Lord."[10]

4. Theological Controversies.—Since by Transubstantiation Christ is not created, but simply made present in the sacramental species, the question arises: How do the Body and Blood of our Lord enter into the accidents of bread and wine? This speculative problem presents some difficulties.

The Thomists hold that Christ becomes present in the sacramental species *per productionem,* the Scotists say that He enters into them *per adductionem,* while *a* third school of theologians, headed by Lessius, describes the manner of His entering into the species as *replicatio aequivalens productioni.*[20] While these theories cannot fully clear up what must of its very nature remain an un-

ie *Apud* Monc, *Laleinisclie und griechisclie Mette» aut dem 2. bit 6. Jahrhundert,* p. 24. Frankfort 1850: *"Descendat, Domine, plenimaiestalis . . . super hunc nobis legitima Eucharistia in transformatione corporis et sangumit Domini."*—Many other similar extracts may be found in Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.,* and cd., Frankfort 1847; Assemani, *Codex Liturg. Ecclesiae Universae,* 13 vola., Rome 1740-66; Denzinger, *Ritus Orient., 3* vols., Würzburg 1864.

20 There is a fourth school of divines (Billot, *De Sacram..* Vol f, 4th ed., pp. 312 sqq.. *367* sqq., Rome 1907; N. Gihr, *Die hl. Sahramente der kath. Kirche,* Vol. I. 2nd ed., pp. 446 sqq., Freiburg 1902, and others) who simply assert that Transubstantiation explains the whole problem and attempt no deeper solution. The Catechism very undecided in the matter *(Dr Each.,* qu. 37).

fathomable mystery, they arc apt at least to throw some light upon the problem, and hence we shall briefly rehearse them.

According to the Thomistic view,[21] when the bread is converted into the Body of Christ, there is reproduced the same Body which was born of the Virgin Mary and now sitteth at the right hand of the Father. St. Thomas' own teaching is not entirely clear on this point. He says that the change which causes Christ's Body to be present in the Holy Eucharist " has something in common with creation and with natural transmutation," [22] and speaks of the Body as " beginning to be anew " in the Blessed Sacrament.[23] This is quite in keeping with certain expressions found in the ancient liturgies and Patristic writings, *e. g.* that the Body of Christ is made or produced out of bread,[24] etc. In matter of fact, Transubstantiation, being a true substantial conversion, creates as well as destroys,[25] and its effect is such that the only reason why it does not actually create the Body of our Lord is that that Body already exists.

It is objected that to assume such repeated creations would jeopardize the numerical identity of the Eucharistic with the heavenly Body of Christ. To this the Thomists reply: The process involved in Transubstantiation is not a new production in the sense of creation, but rather a reproduction of the Body born of the Virgin Mary.[20]

It is further objected that if Transubstantiation in-

21 This teaching is also espoused by Suarez (De *Euchar.,* disp. 50, sect 4), Tanner, Arriaga, Plate), Coninck, Franzelin, Sasse, De Augustinis, Tepe, ct ol.

22 Summo *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 75, art. 8.

23 " *Incipit cite* de novo." (Ibid,,

24 *Fieri, effici, product, creari, recreari,* are some of the terms employed.

26 *V.* supra, Sect. 1.

20 Cfr. Billuart, *De Euchar.*. diss. 1, art. 7: ·▮ *Idcl„ corpus, quod fuit pruno Productum ex Maria Virgine,* reproducitur *ex pane."*

volvcd a positive production, it would entail an equally positive annihilation of the sacred Body when the species cease to exist. This is met by Billuart with the remark: "The Body of Christ does not become annihilated, for it exists elsewhere; it simply ceases to exist under this particular species." [27][28]

A third objection is: If Transubstantiation involved a positive production, the process of conversion would affect not only the substance of the bread, which is destroyed, but likewise the substance of the sacred Body, which is produced,— an assumption repugnant to the doctrine of the impassibility of the glorified Body of Christ. The Thomistic answer to this difficulty may be summarized as follows: The immutable Body of Christ, though it is reproduced many times over in the Holy Eucharist, retains its full identity as a substance; the change is purely accidental, as it affects only the mode of being.

These and other difficulties to which the Thomistic view is subject have led the Scotists to devise their famous theory of "adduction," which, with various modifications, was adopted by Bellarmine, Vasquez,[29] De Lugo,[20] Becanus, Pesch, and other prominent theologians. In saying that the Body of Christ becomes present in the Eucharistic species *per adductionem,* these writers do not mean to assert that the glorified Body is locally moved from Heaven upon the altar.[30] It is quite possible to conceive of that Body as being present in

27 *"Corpus Christi non cadit in nihilum, quum alibi existai, sed tantum dasiuil esse sub istis speciebus panis."* (Billuart, *I. c.).*

28 *Comment, in S. Th.,* HI, di»p. 181, c. ii-13.

20 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 7. sect. *6.*

S0 Cfr. Cat. Rom., P. *s,* qu. 37: *"At vero fieri no» posse constat, ut corpus Christi in sacramento sit, quod ex uno in alium locum venerit; ita enim teret. ut a eae!· sedibus abesset, quoniam nihil movetur, nisi locum deserat, a quo movetur."*

many different places without being moved about in space. The theory of " adduction " [31] is briefly explained by Bcllarniine as follows: " The Body of our Lord pre-exists before the conversion; not, however, under the species of bread. The conversion, therefore, does not cause it simply to begin to exist, but to begin to exist under the appearance of bread. Hence we call this conversion *adductio,* not because through it the Body of Christ leaves its place in Heaven, or is brought hither from Heaven by local motion, but solely because by this process the Body, which previously existed in Heaven only, now also exists under the appearance of bread,— not merely by simple presence or co-existence, but by a certain union, such as that which obtained between the substance of the bread and its accidents, inherence excepted."[32]

Critical Appreciation of These Theories.— The elements of truth contained in these two theories can be combined into a third, which seems to us more satisfactory. Undeniably there is some sort of *adductio* involved in Transubstantiation. This is evident from the fact that the Body of Christ *begins* to exist in a place where it previously did not exist. This mysterious *beginning* is popularly called a " coming down " or " bringing down " from Heaven, which expression may be accepted if purged of its local connotations. But Transubstantia-

31 Henno prefers the term " introductio."

32 Bellarminc, *De Euchar.,* III, 18: *" Corpus* Domini praeexistit ante conversionem, sed non sub speciebns panis; conversio igitur non facit, ut corpus *Chrisli* simpliciter esse incipiat, sed ut incipiat esse sub *spccicbus ponis. Porro* adduclivam vocamus istam conversionem, non quia corpus Chrisli fer hanc *adductionem deserat* suum locum in *caelo vel quia per motum localem huc de caelo adducatur, sed solum quia per* eam *fit, ut corpus Christi, quod antea solum erat in caelo,* iam etiam sit sub *speciebus panis, et non solum sub illis sit per simplicem praesentiam tel cocxistentiam, sed diam per unionem quandam, qualis erat* inter substantiam panis *et ac-*

exCct"à ,a"'en i"·

«iq.)

pp. 3>9

tion, by its very definition,[33] not only destroys one substance; it also produces another, and therefore manifestly involves more than a mere *adductio,* namely, a sort of *productio* or *reproductio* in the Thomistic sense.[34] Not that the glorified Body of Christ is subjected to a substantial change; but by virtue of the consecration it enters upon a new mode of existence *(esse sacramentale),* which, though perfectly real, involves no more than an accidental change. Nevertheless, the power inherent in the words of consecration is so great that, if the substance of the Eucharistic Body did not already exist, those words would as surely call it into being, as the "fiat" of the Almighty created the universe. In this sense the *reproductio* of the Body of our Lord in the Eucharist is conceivable as a merely virtual *productio,* which in respect of the multiplication of the real presences of one and the same Body may also be termed, in the phraseology of Lessius, a *replicatio aequivalens productioni.*[35]

Readings:—J. M. Piccirelli, S. *J., Disquisitio Dogmatica. Critica, Scholastica, Polemica de Catholico Intellectu Dogmatis Transsubstantiationis,* Naples 1912.— D. Coghlan, *De SS. Eucharistia,* pp. 132 sqq., Dublin 1913.

33 *V. supra,* Sect. i.

34 F. *supra,* Sect i, No. 2.

35 Lessiu», *De Perfectionibus Diviuis,* XII. 16, 114 «M·

CHAPTER IV

THE PERMANENCE OF THE REAL PRESENCE AND THE ADORABLENESS OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

From what we have said in the three preceding chapters we may deduce two important corollaries, *viz.:* (i) the Permanence of the Real Presence, and (2) the Adorableness of the Holy Eucharist.

SECTION i

THE PERMANENCE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

i. Heretical Errors vs. the Teaching of the Church.—Luther at first defended the Real Presence against Carlstadt and Zwingli: but later, in his controversy with Butzer and Melanchthon (1536), he arbitrarily restricted it to the moment of reception *(in usu, non extra usum').* This erroneous teaching was adopted into the Formula of Concord, A. D. 1577?

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, holds that Christ is present immediately after the consecration,[1] *ante* and *post usum* as well as *in usu,* —and that His presence consequently does not depend upon the act of eating or drinking in Communion. The Council of Trent defines: "If anyone saith that, after the consecration is completed, the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable Sacrament of the Eucharist, but [are there] only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or

1 " *Extra usum, dum reponitur aut asservatur in pyxide aut ostenditur in processionibus, ut fit apud popistas, sentiunt [LutheraniJ corpus Christi non adesse."*

3 Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Scm. XIII, cap. 3: *". . . slalim post consecra-*

after; and that in the hosts or consecrated particles which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true Body of our Lord reniaineth not; let him be anathema." [3]

This teaching can be convincingly proved from Sacred Scripture and Tradition.

2. The Permanence of the Real Presence Proved from Revelation.—In the deposit of faith the Real Presence and the permanence of that Presence are so closely bound up that in the mind of the Church both continue as one undivided whole.

a) Christ promised to give His Body and Blood to His followers as meat and drink, *i. e.*, as something permanent, something existing before the act of eating and drinking.[4] When, in instituting the Eucharist, He said, "Take ye, and eat, this is my Body," His meaning clearly was, "That which you are about to eat is my Body," and not, "That which you are about to eat will become my Body at the moment when you eat it."[5]

No matter how short the interval of time between consecration and communion, it is certain that the Body

3 Sess. XIII, can. 4: "Si quis dixerit, peractis consecratione in admirabili Eucharistiae sacramento *non tiu corpus et* sanguinem Domini nostri *Ictu Christi. sed* tantum in usu, dum sumitur non autem ante *tel post, el* in *hostiis seu forticulis consecratis, quae fast* communionem reservantur *vel supersunt, non remanere* verum *corpus Domini.* ana- *'*." (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 886).

«John VI, so

of Christ, which the Apostles received at the Last Supper, was really and truly present before they received it. The Council of Trent says: "The Apostles had not as yet received the Eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when nevertheless He Himself affirmed with truth that to be His own Body which He presented [to them]." [eSess. XIII. cap. 3. *"Nondum enim Eucharistiam de manu Domini susceperant, quum vere tamen ipse affirmaret, corpus suum esse, quod praebebat."* (Denringer-Bannwart, n. 876).]

That the Real Presence does not depend upon the actual consumption of the Eucharist is clearly manifest in the case of the Chalice. Christ said: "Drink ye all of this; for *(enim, yap)* this is my Blood."[7] The act of drinking is here evidently neither the cause nor an indispensable condition of the presence of His Blood.[8]

b) The argument from Tradition is so strong that even Calvin was constrained to admit that the Catholic teaching "has in its favor the example of the ancient Church."[9]

a) The belief of the Fathers may be gathered from the texts quoted above in support of the Real Presence.[10] We shall add a few others which expressly assert the permanence of that Presence.

St. Cyril of Alexandria says: "I hear that there are others who assert that the Eulogy profits nothing for sanctification if a portion thereof remains over for the following day. But they who speak thus, speak foolishly; for neither is Christ altered, nor His sacred Body

7 Matth. XXVI. S7 ·*!·

8 For a more exhaustive discussion *of* this point see Bellarmine. *De Euchar.,* IV. a; Tepe, pp. a$o sqq.

changed, but the virtue of the blessing as well as the life-giving grace remain permanently therein." 11

St. Jerome regarded as fortunate those who were permitted to carry off the Body and Blood of Christ in "plaited baskets and in a glass." 12

St. Chrysostom compares the altar on which the Eucharist reposes, with the manger in which the Infant Jesus lay at Bethlehem.13

St. Optatus of Mileve (4- about 400) refers to the altar as ''the seat of both the Body and the Blood of Christ," and to the chalice as " the bearer of the Blood of Christ."14

0) The official practice of the Church was in perfect harmony with this teaching.

In the early days the faithful frequently carried the Blessed Eucharist home16 or took it with them when they travelled,10 a custom which continued in some places to the twelfth century.11 The deacons were accustomed to bring the Blessed Sacrament to those who were unable to attend divine service,18 as well as to the martyrs, prisoners, and the infirm.10 The " Apostolic Constitutions," which were probably composed in the eighth century, instruct deacons to place the particles remaining after Communion in specially prepared receptacles called " Pasto-

11 Ep. ad Calosyr. (Migne, P. G., VXXVI, 1075).

it Ep. 123 ad Rustic., n. so: " Nihil ilia ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem forlat in vitro."

18 In S. Philogon., n. 3.

M *De* Schism. Donat., IV, 1 sq. (Migne, *P. L.,* XI. >065, 1068). Cfr. Bellarmine, De Euchar., IV, 4.

is Cfr. Tertullian, *Ad Uxor., II,* S'. St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis,* n. 26.

ie Cfr. St. Ambrose, *De Excessu* Fratris, I, 43 and 46.

it Cfr. Hefelc, *Concilicngcschichte,* Vol. Ill, 2nd cd., pp. 583, 752, Freiburg 1877.

18 Cfr. Justin Martyr, *Apolog.,* I, n. 67.

10 Cfr. Eusebius, Hist. *Bed.,* VI, 44.

phoria." [20] Furthermore, as early as the fourth century,[21] it was customary to celebrate the " Mass of the Presanctified," [22] which the Latin Church now restricts to Good Friday, while the Greeks, since the Council in Trullo (692), celebrate it daily during the whole of Lent.

c) The Permanence of the Real Presence may be further proved and illustrated by the following philosophical considerations:

a) The fundamental reason is found in the fact that some time necessarily elapses between consecration and communion. This is not the case with the other Sacraments. Baptism, for instance, lasts only as long as the baptismal act, or ablution lasts, and is therefore called a *sacramentum transitorium.* The Holy Eucharist, on the contrary, is a permanent Sacrament *(sacramentum permanens').* "The other Sacraments," says the Council of Trent, "begin to have the power of sanctifying *[then]* only when one uses them, whereas in the Eucharist, before being used, there is the very author of sanctity." [28] And again: "If anyone saith that, after the consecration is completed, the Body and Blood of our Lord *Jesus* Christ are not in the admirable Sacrament of the Eucharist, but [are there] only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that in the hosts or consecrated particles which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true Body of the Lord remaineth not; let him be anathema." [2*]

20 Cfr. *Conftit. /Ipost.*. VIII, 13: *OI διάκονοι τά ntpiaatvaavTa ΐϊσφιρίτωσαν els rà ττραστοφάρια.*

21 Cfr. *Synod. Laodic.,* can. 49.

22 *Missa Praesanclificalorum.*

28 Sess. XIII, «»P· 3; *"deliqua sacramenta tunc primum sanctificandi firn habent, quum quis illis utitur; at in Eucharistia ipse sanctitatis auctae ante (et post) usum est."*

Ibid., can. 4 (quoted supra, p. >30. n. 3).

No doubt Christ might have made the Eucharist a merely transitory Sacrament had He so willed. Dut this was evidently not His intention. It is inconsistent and arbitrary to say, as Chemnitz docs, that Christ is truly present whilst the Sacrament is taken to the sick, but that His presence ceases as soon as the Eucharist is reserved for other purposes.[25] Leibniz, though a Protestant, was keen enough to perceive that cither the words of consecration pronounced by the priest are false, or that which is blessed is necessarily the Body of Christ, even before it is eaten.[20]

β) The Permanence of the Real Presence, however, is limited to an interval of time, the beginning of which is determined by the instant of consecration, while the end is rather difficult to ascertain. The only thing that is theologically certain is that Christ continues to be present under the appearances of bread and wine as long as these appearances are apt to contain within themselves the substances of bread and wine. When corruption *(corruptio specierum)* sets in, *e. g.* when the host becomes mouldy or the contents of the Chalice sour, Christ is no longer present. The cessation of the Real Presence must not, however, be conceived as a "retransubstantiation,"[27] for while Christ may be the *terminus ad quern* of a substantial conversion, He can never become its *terminus a quo.*

st, Cfr. Bellartninc, *De Eucharistia,* IV. i.

so Sy«l. Theol., c. 48. We quote the passage in its context: " Cerium ed onhquilalcm tradidisse, ipsâ co»· secratione fieri conversionem. neque unquam veteribus audilum eel novum quorundam dogma, quod in momento *perceptionis* demum adsit *corpus* Christi. Cerium enim cd. nonnullos sacrum hunc cibum non slalim consumpsisse, sed aliis misisse et secitni *domum, imo* in ih'ticra. *deserta tulisse eumque morem aliquando fuisse commendatum, quamquam postea abrogatus sit maioris reverentiae causa. Et profecto,* aut *falsa sunt,* quae a *sacerdote pronuntiantur* verba institutionis, quod absit, aut *nccesse est, quod* benedictum est, *esse corpus Christi, etiam* antequam mandiicclur."

« Oswald seems tu favor this view (Die hl. Sakramcnlc, pp. 409 sqq.).

The simplest explanation is that the process of corruption brings back those elementary substances which correspond to the peculiar nature of the changed accidents. Thus the miracle of the Eucharistic conversion does not abolish the law of the indestructibility of matter.

SECTION 2

THE ADORABLENESS OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

I. State of the Question.—If Christ is really, truly, and substantially present in the Holy Eucharist, the adorableness of the Blessed Sacrament requires no further proof for anyone who believes in His Divinity.

As we have shown in Christology,[1] the same worship *(cultus latriae)* is due to the God-man Jesus Christ that is due to the Triune God. Now, it is Jesus Christ who is truly present in the Eucharist; consequently the Eucharist is adorable.

This truth is not affected by the circumstance that the Eucharist was primarily instituted as a sacrificial meal (Communion). It is always the God-man Himself who is offered in the Mass and consumed in Communion. The Council of Trent says: "For not therefore is it [the Holy Eucharist] the less to be adored on this account, that it was instituted by Christ the Lord in order to be received: for we believe that same God to be present therein, of whom the Eternal Father, when introducing Him into the world, says: 'And let all the angels of God adore Him.'"[2] In other words, the Eucharistic

1 Pohle-Preuss, Christology, pp. 278 sqq. 2nd ed., St. Louis 1916.

2 Sess. XIII, cap. 5: "*Neque enim idea* minus *est* adorandum, quod *fuerit a Christo Domino,* ut sumatur, institutum; nam *illum eundem Deum praesentem* in *eo adesse credimus,* quem Pater aeternus in-

Christ is substantially identical, and therefore equally adorable, with the Lord Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father in Heaven.

Because of this identity the Tridentine Council solemnly defines: "If anyone saith that, in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external, of *latria,* and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, . . . and that the adorers thereof are idolaters; let him be anathema." [3]

In the absence of Scriptural proof this proposition must be demonstrated from Tradition.

2. Argument From Tradition.—A broad distinction must of course be made between the dogmatic principle of the adorableness of the Holy Eucharist and the varying discipline with regard to the outward form of worship given to it. Though the principle was recognized from the beginning, there has been, at least in the Latin Church, a gradual development in the external pomp with which the devotion to the Eucharist was surrounded.

troducens in orbem terrarum dicit: Et adorent cum omnes angeli." (Denzinger-Bannwart. η. 878).

3 Ses». XWI. can· 6: "Si *dirent, in ss. Eucharistiae sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu lalriae etiam esterno adorandum atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum, . . . et eius adoratores esse idolâtras, anathema sit.'** (Denzinger-Bannwart. n. 888).

a) The principle itself was clearly enunciated by the Fathers.

The early Patristic writers quite naturally speak of the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament in connection with the Mass and Communion.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) exhorts his neophytes as follows: "When thou approachest, do not come with outspread hands and fingers, but make thy left hand as it were the throne of the right, which is destined to receive the King, and receive the Body of Christ into the hollow of thy hand and say, 'Amen.' After thou hast purified thine eyes by cautiously applying them to the sacred Body, be careful, in consuming it, that no particle falls to the ground. . . . Having partaken of the Body of Christ, step forward to take the Chalice of the Blood ;4 do not stretch out thy hands, but drop them and, assuming an attitude of adoration and homage,6 say 'Amen,' and sanctify thyself by participation in the Blood of Christ. And whilst the moisture thereof still adheres to thy lips, touch it with thy hands and sanctify therewith the eyes, the forehead, and the other senses. Finally, awaiting the [concluding] prayer, give thanks to God, who has vouchsafed thee such great mysteries." 0

St. Ambrose says: "By 'footstool' [Ps. XCVIII, 5] is understood the earth ; by the earth, the Flesh of Christ, which we adore to-day in the mysteries, and which the Apostles adored in our Lord Jesus." 7

♦προσίρχοί' καί ποτηρίφ τού αίματοι-
s τρόιτω προσκυρήσίωί καί *σιβάσ*-μαros
β *Catech. Mysi.,* V. η. ϊι (Mignc, *P. C.,* XXXIII, i>2S W·)

l Dc Spiritu Sancto, III, ii, 79: *"Per scabellum terra intellegitur, per terram autem caro Christi, quam hodiedum in mysteriis adoramus el quam Apostoli in Domino lesu adoraverunt.·* (MiEne, *P. XVI*

Commenting on the same Psalm, St. Augustine says: "No one eats this Flesh unless he has previously adored [it].'"[8]

A passage in the Syriac Liturgy of St. James reads: "Let us adore and praise the living Lamb of God, who is offered upon the altar."[9]

b) In the early Church, the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament was restricted chiefly, as it still is among the Greeks, to the Mass and Communion.

However, as late as 1672, a schismatic synod held at Jerusalem declared: "We likewise [believe] that the same Body and Blood of the Lord should be worshipped with supreme honor and adored with the worship of *latria,* since there is one adoration of the Blessed Trinity and the Body and Blood of the Lord."[10]

In the West the way was opened to a more exalted veneration of the Blessed Sacrament when the faithful were allowed to receive holy Communion apart from the liturgical service. After the Berengarian controversy, in the twelfth century, the present practice of reservation was introduced for the express purpose of enabling the faithful to adore the Sacred Host outside of the Mass. In the thirteenth century, the so-called "theophoric processions" came into vogue, and the Feast of Corpus

8 *In Ps.,* 98, n. 9. *"Nemo illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit."* (Aligne, *P. L.,* XXXVII, 1264).

9 *"Adoremus et laudemus Agnum vivum Dei, qui offertur super altare."* (Renaudot. *Liturg. Orient.,* 2nd ed., Vol. II, p. 29. Frankfort 1847).

10 *"Item (credimus) et supremo colendum honore cultuque latriae idem Domini corpus et sanguinem esse adorandum, quippe ss. Trinitatis*

Christi was instituted by Urban IV at the solicitation of St. Juliana of Liège. Henceforth the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament became general among the faithful. Beautiful hymns, like the *"Pange lingua"* of St. Thomas, were composed in its honor. In the fourteenth century it became customary to expose the Blessed Sacrament for public adoration. Of the Corpus Christi processions the Council of Trent declares "that very piously and religiously was this custom introduced into the Church, that this sublime and venerable Sacrament be, with special veneration and solemnity, celebrated every year on a certain festival day, and that it be borne reverently and with honor in processions through the streets and public places." [11] A new impetus was given to the adoration of the Eucharist when St. Alphonsus de' Liguori introduced the custom of paying regular visits to our Lord hidden in the tabernacle. Since then numerous orders and congregations have devoted themselves to the unceasing adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, the devotion of "Perpetual Prayer" has been introduced into many dioceses, Eucharistic Leagues have been established among the clergy, Eucharistic Congresses are regularly held, and all these agencies conspire to keep alive an ardent and devout faith in Him who said: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." [12]

11 Stss. XIII, cap. 5; ·▮ *Declarat* ranclo Synod»», *pie el religiose admodum* in Dei Eceleiiom inductum *fuisse* hunc morem, ut ringuh» anni» *peculiari quodam* et *feslo* die *praecelsum hoc* et venerabile Moramentum lingulari veneratione ac Mlemnitate celebraretur, utque in *processionibus* reverenter et honorifice illud *per vias* et *loca publica circumferre-fur."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 878).

12 Matth. XXVIII, 20.—Cfr. Jacob Hoffmann, *Die f'erehrung and Anbetung des allerheiligsten Saferameutes des Altars gcschichtlich dargestellt,* Kempten 1897; T. E. Brid· p,ett. *History of the Holy Eucharist* in Great *Britain,* new ed., London >910; F. Raible, *Der Tabernake)* ein«l und *jetet,* Freiburg 1908.

3· A Theological Questioi V.—Theologians are wont to discuss the question whether and to what extent the sacred species participate in the worship rendered to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.

The adoration which Catholics give to Christ under the appearances of bread and wine is not separate and distinct from that which, they give to the sacred species as such. The one sole and total object of the Eucharistic cult is our Eucharistic Lord Himself, that is to say, Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, or the Sacrament as such.13 We do not "adore bread" *(adoratio panis, ἀρτοΧατράα),* because, according to Catholic teaching, the substance of bread is no longer present in the Holy Eucharist and we give no separate adoration to its accidents. The object of our adoration is the *totum sacramentale.*14

If one were with idolatrous intent to adore the species apart from their contents (», *e.* Christ), he would commit a greater sacrilege than if he would give divine worship to the Sacred Heart, as a creature, and apart from the Hypostatic Union; for, unlike the Sacred Heart, the sacramental species are not a part of the Hypostatic Union. It follows that the sacred species, as such, are not entitled to latreutic but only to dulic, or. more accurately speaking, to hyperdulic worship,15 though in practice neither the Church nor the faithful pay any at-

13 Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XIII, cap. s: *"Omnes Christi fideles pro more in catholica Ecclesia recepto lalriae cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic ss. sacramento in veneratione exhibent."*

14 Cfr. on this point Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. *6$,* sect· ··

ι· On the notions *latrie, duhe,* and *hyperdulia. ace* I'ohle-PreuM, *Manotogy.* PP· »4® *M‹l·. St Louis

tention to this subtle distinction, but simply adore the Blessed Sacrament as *unum morale.*[10]

ifl Cfr. Vasquez, *Comment. in S. Th.,* 1П, qu. 108, c, iaj De Lugo, *De Myst. Incarn.,* disp. 26, acct u. 7a.

CHAPTER V

SPECULATIVE DISCUSSION OF THE MYSTERY OF THE REAL PRESENCE

"First believe, then inquire," must be the loadstar of all theological speculation. *Fides quaerit intellectum.* Though the Scholastics evolved a number of reasons why it is fit that Christ should be really and substantially present in the Holy Eucharist,[1] after all is said, the human intellect, even when illumined by faith, can not fathom the mystery nor demonstrate its intrinsic possibility. The Eucharist belongs to the category of absolute theological mysteries. Christian philosophy can do no more than refute the objections raised against the dogma and show that it is not repugnant to reason.

Unbelievers contend that the mystery of the Real Presence involves three glaring contradictions, to wit: (i) the existence of accidents without their natural subject; (2) a spiritual mode of existence on the part of a material body; and (3) the simultaneous existence of that body in many places.

We will try to refute these three objections in as many Sections.

1 Cfr. N. Gihr, *Die hl. Sakramcnte der kaihKirthe.* VoL J. Jnd ed.

SECTION i

FIRST APPARENT CONTRADICTION: THE CONTINUED EXISTENCE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SPECIES WITHOUT THEIR NATURAL SUBJECT

In order to refute the first objection, it is necessary to answer three questions, *vis.:* (i) Do the outward appearances of bread and wine continue to exist without the substances of bread and wine as their connatural subjects? (2) Are these appearances *(accidentia sine subtecto)* physical entities or mere subjective impressions? (3) Are substanceless accidents possible, and if so, how can they be explained from the philosophical point of view?

The first of these questions can be answered with certainty of faith; for the second we have theological certainty only, while the third is a matter of speculation.

i. The Continued Existence of the Accidents of Bread and Wine Without Their Natural Substrata.—The dogma of Transubstantiation implies that the entire substance of the bread and the entire substance of the wine are converted, respectively, into the substances of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that the conversion takes place in such a way that "only the appearances of bread and wine remain."[1]

1 Cone. *Trid.,* Sess. XIII, can. a.

Hence, what the senses perceive after the consecration are merely the appearances without their substances.[2]

a) If it be further asked, whether these appearances have any subject at all in which they inhere, the answer is that they are *accidentia sine subiecto* and owe their continued existence to a miracle. This is not an article of faith, but it is part and parcel of the traditional teaching of the Church.[3] To deny it would be tantamount to asserting that the Body of Christ supplies the substance of the bread and becomes the subject of its remaining accidents.[4] This is to be rejected because the Body of Christ sustains its own accidents, both natural · and supernatural," and cannot assume those of a foreign substance ; and furthermore because it is both impassible and immutable, whereas the Eucharistic species are subject to change. " It is manifest," says St. Thomas, " that these accidents are not subjected in the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, because the substance of the human body cannot be in any way affected by such accidents ; nor is it possible for Christ's glorious and impassible Body to be altered so as to receive these qualities." [7] Suarez adds that, as the Eucharistic Body of Christ ex-

2 *V. supra,* Ch. III. Sect. a.

3 Suarez, Toletus, De Lugo, and others declare this to be a *"propositio fidei."* Their opinion is not shared by the majority of theologians. but all without exception defend it as absolutely certain. The proof of this assertion will be found in Theoph. Raynaud. S. J., *Exuviae Panis et I'ini.* Lyons 1665.

4 This is held by A. Leray. *Le Dogme de fEucharislie,* Paris 1900.

s Form, figure, etc.

e Impassibility, spirituality, etc.—l·'. Eschatology.

T *Summa Theo!.,* ja. qu. *n,* art i : *"Manifestum est autem quod huiusmodi accidentia non snnt* in *substantia*

ists in a spatially uncircumscribed and spirit-like manner,[8] there is in the Holy Eucharist no substratum fit to assume quantitative and divisible accidents. Schell tried to solve this difficulty by declaring the Body of Christ to be the "metaphysical subject of the Eucharistic appearances."[0] But this brings us no nearer to a satisfactory solution of the problem. How are we to conceive of the distinction between a physical and a metaphysical subject? The Body of Christ, as *eus in se,* is either the real subject of the Eucharistic accidents, or it is not. If it is, the metaphysical is at the same time the physical subject, and the objections remain. If it is not, then the Eucharistic appearances are clearly *accidentia sine subtecto.* The most that could be said is that the Body of Christ is the metaphysical subject of the Eucharistic accidents in so far as it radiates a miraculous sustaining power which supports the appearances bereft of their natural substances and preserves them from collapse. But in adopting this view we should be leaving the domain of material causes, to which a substance as the subject of accidents belongs, and entering that of efficient causes, in which the solution of the problem, as formulated by Or. Schell, cannot be sought.

b) The position of the Church may be gathered from the definitions of the Councils of Constance (1414-1418) and Trent (1545-1563)·

The Council of Constance, in its eighth session, approved by Martin V in 1418, condemned the following propositions of Wiclif: (1) "The material substance of bread and likewise the material substance of wine remain in the Sacrament of the Altar;" (2) "The acci-

8 *I'. tupra..* Ch. II, Thesis 4, pp, 98 sqq.
0 Dogmalik, Vol. III, 2, p. 53$, Padciborn 1892.

dents of the bread do not remain without a subject." ,rt The first of these propositions involves an open denial of the dogma of Transubstantiation. The second might be considered as merely a different wording of the first, did not the history of the Council show that Wiclif had violently opposed the Scholastic doctrine of "accidents without a subject." 11 Hence it was the evident intention of the Council to condemn the second proposition not merely as a conclusion drawn from the first, but as a distinct and independent thesis.12 We may therefore sum up the teaching of the Church in this proposition, which represents the contradictory of the one condemned: "The accidents of the bread remain without a subject." 13

This interpretation of the decree of Constance is confirmed by the Council of Trent, which defines: ''If anyone . . . denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood,— the species only of the bread and wine remaining,— let him be anathema.''14 According to this definition something remains of the bread and wine after the consecration. Is it part of the respective substances of bread and wine? No; the whole substance of the bread has been converted into the Body and the whole substance of the wine into the Blood of Christ. What, then, remains? The Council tells us that it is "the species of

10 *"Art. I. Substantia panis materialis et similiter substantia vini materialis remanent in sacramento altaris.-— "Art. 2. Accidentia panis non manent sine subtecto tn eodem sacramento."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 581 8<1> . .

U Cfr. De Augustinis, *De He Sacramentaria,* Vol. I» =nd ed., pp. 573 ««Il-

ia Cfr. Hardouin, *Coll. Cone.,* Vol. VIII, p. 404.

n Sess. X1П, can. a: - *Si quis . . . necaverit conversionem totius substantiae panis in corpus et talius substantiae fini in i.inguinrm.*

bread and wine." These species must, therefore, be accidents, and, having by Transubstantiation lost their connatural subjects, which cannot be supplied by the Body of Christ, they are clearly *accidentia sine subiecto.* Such was the teaching of contemporary theologians, and the Roman Catechism, referring to the above-quoted Tridentine canon, tersely explains: "All the accidents of bread and wine we indeed may see; however, they inhere in no subject, but exist by themselves." 15 And: ". . . as the accidents cannot inhere in the Body and Blood of Christ, it remains that, in a manner altogether above the order of nature, they sustain themselves, supported by nothing else; this has been the uniform and constant doctrine of the Catholic Church." 10

2. The Physical Reality of the Eucharistic Accidents.—Though such eminent theologians as Gregory of Valentia, Suarez, Vasquez, and De Lugo hold the physical reality of the Eucharistic accidents to be an article of faith, it is no more than a theological conclusion. Certain writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who inclined to Cartesianism, asserted that the Eucharistic appearances are optical de-

Catech. Rom., De Euchar., qu. »6: *"Ac panic quidem et* vini *accidentia* omnia *licet videre, quae tamen* nulli /ubrtantiac inhaerent, *ccd per ce ipsa constant."*

W Ibid., qu. 43: "Quoniam ca occidentia diruti *corpori ct* /anguini inhaerere non />ocjunl, relinquitur, ut *super omnem* naturae *ordinem ipea ce.* nullâ olid re nûa, *sustentent: haec perpetua ct conctanc fuit catholicae Ecclesiae doctrina."*— On the whole subject see Billuart, *De Mente Ecclesiae circa Accidentia Eucharistica,* Lcodii 1714.— Lately Dr. D. Coghlan has defended the opinion that the condemnation of Wiclif's second proposition docs not oblige us to hold that the accidents have, after the consecration. no subject whatever (De SS. *Eucharistia,* Dublin 1913). For a criticism of this view sec the *Irish Eccles. Record,* 1913, pp. 437 sqq-

lusions, phantasmagoria, or make-believe accidents. This view is derogatory to the traditional belief of the Church, as can be shown from the writings of the Fathers and the Schoolmen, and from the definitions of several ecumenical councils.

a) The Fathers draw a clear-cut and sometimes even exaggerated distinction between the "visible sign" *{species panis et vini)* and the "invisibly present Body and Blood of Christ" *{corpus et sanguis invisibiliter praesens).*

Some represent the sacramental sign as a "type," "symbol" or "figure" of the Body of Christ. This is ambiguous, but no doubt these Fathers regarded the sacramental sign as something equally objective and physical with the Body itself. Atzberger [17] summarizes their teaching as follows: "These Fathers clearly distinguish between the visible element and the invisible Body of Christ, and refer to the former as *πράγμα Ιπίγαον*[13] as *αυτό* το υλικόν,[10] as *φαινόμενο* apros,*[20] as *αισθητά πράγματα,*[31] as *signum* or *sacramentum corporis Christi.*[12] When the Monophysites concluded from the fact of the conversion of the bread and wine into the Flesh and Blood of Christ that there was also a conversion of our Saviour's humanity into His Divinity, their Catholic opponents expressly declared that the mystical symbols do

17 In the continuation of Scheeben's *Dogmatik,* Vol. IV, a, pp. 607 sq. Freiburg igor.

18 St. Irenaeus. *Adv. Hacr.,* IV, c. 18, n. 5.

10 Origen. *In Maith.*. XI. n. 14.

20 St Cyril of Jerusalem, *Caltch. Mytt.*. IV, n. 9-

21 St Chrysostom, *Hom. in Maith., 83.* n. 4.

22 *St* Augustine. *C. Adimant., C. ia.* n. 3: loin. *Eput.* 98, n. 9.

not lose their otWa φύσκ through the consecration,[23] but the nature of the bread remains,[24] and that it does not lose its αίσθητη ονσία."[20] Atzberger is right in attaching considerable importance to the controversial attitude of the Fathers towards the Monophysites; for it plainly appears from the Patristic writings directed against these heretics that the Church asserted both the reality of the Eucharistic accidents and their identity before and after Transubstantiation. Thus Theodoret in his second Dialogue tells his Monophysitic opponent: "You are caught in the net which you yourself have spread; for the mystic symbols do not lose their nature after the consecration, but remain in the figure and the sensible form of their essence; they are visible and can be seen and touched as before."[20] Had the Fathers regarded the Eucharistic species as optical delusions, they would not have used such strong language nor neglected a middle term by means of which they could have effectively combated the Monophysitic notion that the humanity of Christ is converted into His Divinity.

b) The Schoolmen unanimously inculcated the physical reality of the Eucharistic accidents and their identity before and after Transubstantiation. In taking this attitude these writers were moved by philosophical as well as theological considerations.

Descartes (1596-1650) was the first philosopher who placed the essence of corporeal substances in their actual

23 Cfr. Theodore», Dial., II (Migne. *P.* G., LXXXHI, 168).

2» PseudoChrysostom, E|>. ad *Caior.* (Migne, P. G., Lil, 758).

25 Ephraem of Antioch, in Migne, P. G,, CII, 980.

20 Dial., Il (Migne, LXXX1H, 168).

extension and recognized only modal accidents metaphysically united with their substance. According to his theory, the Eucharistic accidents simply cannot exist without a subject, but disappear as soon as the substances of bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of Christ. To adapt the Catholic teaching to the "new philosophy," some theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries declared the Eucharistic species to be delusions caused by God in the senses. The inventor of this theory of *apparences eucharistiques* was E. Maignan, O. M.[27] He was followed by J. Saguens, J. Perrimezzi, A. Pissy, Drouin,[23] and Witasse." The Church at first showed great tolerance towards the Cartesians, but in course of time found herself compelled to oppose them. Thus, in 1694, the S. Congregation of the Index condemned the proposition that "The Eucharistic accidents are not real accidents, but mere illusions and optical make-believes."[30]

The great majority of contemporary and later theologians rejected the Cartesian theory as inconsistent with ecclesiastical tradition, contrary to the testimony of the senses, opposed to the true concept of Transubstantiation, repugnant to the correct notion of a Sacrament, which requires a visible sign, and incompatible with the phrase *"fractio panis"* applied to the Eucharist in Holy Scripture.[31]

27 *Philosophia Sacra,* Vol. I. c.

28 De *Re Sacramentaria,* IV, *2,* S 2.

29 *De Eucharistia,* sect. *2,* qu. *2,* art. 3.

80 "*Eucharistiae accidentia non accidentia realia, sed merae illusiones et praestigia oculorum sunt.*"

81 For a fuller discussion of tbe Cartesian theory we must refer the student to Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* diss. I. art. 6. J *2.* The history of the controversy may be studied in Theoph. Raynaud. S. J.. *E.ruviae Panis et Pini (Opera.* Vol. VI. pp. 419 sqq.). Lyons 1665, and I. Sailer. O. -M.. *Historia Scholastics de Speciebus Eucharisticis.* Lyons 16βr.

c) As for the conciliary definitions on this subject, it is not necessary to add a great deal to what we have previously quoted from the councils of Constance and Trent.

The Cartesians claimed that the Council of Trent, in employing the term *"species panis et vini,"*[22] did not mean to say that the appearances of bread and wine after the consecration are real accidents.[33] But it is a fact that the Council of Constance, in speaking of the same thing, deliberately uses the term *"accidentia."* If Martin V in his questionary for suspected Wiclifites and Hussites again employs *"species,"*[2*] this simply proves that *"species"* and *"accidentia"* were regarded as synonymous terms. There can be no doubt that the Council of Trent employs *"species"* exclusively in its scholastic signification of *"species sensibilis,"* which is an *"accidens reale,"* and not in the Cartesian sense of *"species intentionalis,"* which was a later invention.

3. The Philosophic Possibility of Absolute Accidents.—Leaving the domain of doctrine for that of philosophical speculation, we find ourselves on uncertain ground. To justify the Church's teaching in the matter, however, nothing more is necessary than to show that the

[22] Sess. XIII, can. a.

[33] Witasse, strangely enough, sings a hymn oi praise to Providence fur having preserved the Tridentinc Council, as well as the Fourth Council of the Lateran before it (Cap. "Firmiter," *apud* Dcneinger-Bannwart, n. 428 *Sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur")* from the terrible mistake of employing the term *"accidentia"* instead of *"species."*

[2*] Cfr. Dcnzingcr-Bannwart, n. 666 sq.

concept of absolute or substanceless accidents involves no metaphysical contradiction.

a) Modal accidents, of course, by their very definition, cannot be separated from their underlying subjects. But there are other accidents (c. *g.* corporeal quantity), the separate existence of which involves no intrinsic contradiction.

Accidents of the last-mentioned kind are called *absolute,* because their objective reality is quite distinct from that of their underlying substance.[88] Aristotle defined quantity as a phenomenon of substance.[386] It was merely a logical deduction from this statement to say, as the Schoolmen did, that quantity may be separated from its subject and, therefore, is capable of continuing to exist independently. There is no intrinsic contradiction involved in this assertion, for it has not been and cannot be proved that an accident derives its entire being solely from its underlying subject, or that actual (which differs from purely aptitudinal) inherence is of the very nature of an accident.[37] For the rest, our knowledge of material substances and their accidental qualities is still so meagre that the greatest uncertainty reigns among the learned concerning the nature of matter, one system pulling down what another has reared. To explain the spiritual by the material, as Materialism tries to do, is foolish, because matter is practically an unknown quantity, about which we know even less than we do about the soul, its

36 Suarez, *Metaph.,* disp. 7, sect

30 *Melaph.,* VI, 3 (cd. Bckker, p. 1029, a, »3): Τὸ *δί μηκοτ καί πλάτοί καί βάΟοι ποσότητά river.* ἀλλ' *οΰκ ουσία- τί› γὰρ* ττοσὸι- *ούκ ουσία.* ὠλλὰ *μάλλον ὐ ὑπΛρχπ* ταὗτα *ττρώτω. fxeîvA* ὠτι *ή ουσία*

ST Cfr. Palmieri. *Irutit. Philoe..* Vol. I. pp. 366 sqq.. Rome 1S74; Gutberlet, XZ/feaseme *MehtphrM.* qth ed.. pp. 6a sqq., Munster 1906; P. Coffey. *Ontoloiy.* pp. *4«› aqq., London 1914.

qualities and powers. One of the keenest of modern philosophers, Leibniz (1646-1716), expressed himself as follows on this problem :[88] "As there are many eminent and clever men, especially among the members of the Reformed Church, who, deeply imbued with the principles of a new and captivating philosophy [Cartesianism], imagine that they can clearly and distinctly perceive that the essence of a body consists in its extension, and accidents are mere *modi* of their substance and consequently can no more exist without, or be separated from, their subject than the uniformity of the periphery can be detached from the circle, . . . we deem it our duty to come to their aid. . . . We, too, have occupied ourselves assiduously with mathematical, mechanical and experimental studies, and at first inclined to the same view which we now criticize. But in course of time we were compelled by our researches to return to the principles of the ancient philosophy [t. *e.* Scholasticism], . . . which are by no means so confused and absurd as they seem to those who ridicule Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and other illustrious men as if they were mere schoolboys." [89]

b) The old theology tried to prove the possibility of absolute accidents on the basis of Hylomorphism. Some present-day theologians would like to come to an understanding with modern science by adopting Dynamism. There are other philosophical systems which openly contradict the

88 Leibniz, *Systema Thcol.,* c. 48 eq.. Paris 1719.

8» On the separability of absolute accidents from their underlying subjects see further T. Pesch, S. J., *Philosophia Naturali»,* pp. 399 sqq., and cd., Freiburg 1897; J. Rickaby, S.]., General Af*etaphysics.* pp. 367 sqq.. New York 1890; H. Haan, S. J., *Philosophia Naturalis,* pp. 19 sqq., Freiburg 1894.

Church's teaching, but they are equally opposed to reason and experience.

a) Aristotclean-Scholastic Hylomorphism holds that bodies are constituted by the union of primordial matter *(materia prima, Ζλη πρώτη)* with a substantial form *(forma substantialis, μορφή ουσιώδη* , £ντιλ«χ«α) ; that there is a real distinction between corporeal substance and its quantity; that the two are separable, and that by divine power the latter can exist without the former.

The Schoolmen explain this as follows: A body *(corpus, υ\η δΐντίρα)* is a substance composed of matter and form. Quantity *(quantum, ποσόν)* is that by which a body has extension in space. The two notions and their underlying entities are entirely distinct from each other, and therefore separable. Quantity is perceived by the senses, whereas substance can be recognized only by the intellect.

It is objected that this theory, by separating quantity from substance, raises an accident, which is *ens in alio,* to the rank of a substance *(ens in se),* and thereby incurs an intrinsic contradiction. St. Thomas refutes this as follows: "The other accidents which remain in this sacrament are subjected in the dimensive quantity of the bread and wine that remains: first of all, because something having quantity and color and affected by other accidents is perceived by the senses, nor is sense deceived in such. Secondly, because the first disposition of matter is dimensive quantity; . . . third, because . . . dimensive quantity is the principle of individuation." 40 At the present time it is necessary to take

io Summa Theo!.. 38, qu. 77. art. *quantitate dimennva panie t:-l* ¦ ·λ(

into consideration the theory that colors and sounds as such are not inherent in bodies but have their objective *raison d'etre* in the undulations of the ether.41

β) By Dynamism we here understand not the philosophic system associated with the names of Herbart, Ulrici, Kant, and Schelling, but the theory which holds that elementary substances are endowed with certain fundamental energies whose effects are distinct from both and can therefore be supplied by the First Cause. This theory was broached by Leibniz and developed by Franzelin.42 Hurter explains it briefly as follows: The fundamental power of matter, to which all others, such as the force of gravity, density, and color, may be reduced, is energy or the power of resistance *(vis resistentiae,* cvcpycta). As force is not conceivable without its manifestation, or energy without its effect, it is necessary to distinguish between *vis* and *impetus, Ivίργαα* and *ivίργημα.* While energy enters into the essence of matter, its manifestation or effect *(ivίργημα)* is really distinct from it, and may miraculously continue after the material substratum is gone.

This explanation has the advantage of conforming more closely than any other yet proposed, to modern physics, which reduces the powers of nature to pure movements and applies to them the mathematical principles of mechanics.43 Since Newton three systems of natural philosophy have successively attracted the minds of men: the dynamic theory (Newton), the kinetic the-

bxi *affectum, nec* in *talibus sensus decipitur; secundo quia prima dispositio materiae cet quantitas* dimenriva . . *tertio quia* . ·. . quontilar *dimensiva est quoddam individuationis principium."*

«1 Cfr. Gutbcrlct, *Psychologie,* 4th ed.. pp. 14 sqq., Munster 1904.

42 De Eucharistia. thes. 12.

<3 Cfr. A. Secchi, *L'Unità dclle Forge Fisiche,* Rome 1864; German tr.. *Die Einheit der Naturkraftc, o* vols., 3rd ed., Leipzig 1892.

ory (Lord Kelvin, Secchi), and the energetic theory (Ostwald). A close analysis shows that these theories are not opposed to one another but can be reconciled and combined at least in their main features. "When physical science shall have attained its final perfection at some distant date in the future," says Father L. Dressel, S. J., "it will see every natural process alike as dynamic, kinetic, and energetic, for one perception presupposes the others. Without movement and tension there is no energy. Energy in all its forms demands in the body which possesses it a disposition or condition by which it becomes effective."[44][45][46] Since the traditional view can be easily reconciled with this teaching, it follows that the atomic theory, with which the dynamic, the kinetic, and the energetic theory alike stand or fall, is not opposed to the dogmatic teaching of the Church on the Eucharist, as some timid souls imagine. For this reason it would be unwise to reject *a priori* the solutions devised by Tongiorgi[48] and Palmieri[49] on the basis of the atomic theory, especially since these writers admit the objective resistance and the imponderable materia of ether, respectively, as objective realities in the converted substances of bread and wine. Even so staunch a peripatetic as Father Tilmann Pesch, S. *J.,* believes that Tongiorgi's as well as Palmieri's views can be reconciled with the dogmatic teaching of the Church.[47] Really the only thing that can be said against Tongiorgi and Palmieri is

44 *Lehrbuch der Physik nach den neuesten Anschauungen,* Vol. II, 3rd ed., p. 1036, Freiburg 1905.

46 *Cosmologia,* n. 237.

45 *Inslit. Philos.,* Vol. II, pp. 182 sqq., Rome 1875.

47 T. Pesch, *Inst. Phil. Nat.*. 2nd ed., p. 401, Freiburg 1897: *"Et haec quidem explicandi ratio ad Christianas doctrinas accommodari fortasse satis potest. Adest enim signum sensibile obieclivum; servantur species panis et vini; id quod permanet, non pani inhaeret; accidentia manent sine subtecto; adest conversio, quum aliquid maneat commune."*

that they do not sufficiently safeguard the identity of the Eucharistic accidents before and after the consecration. But this is not an insuperable difficulty, since even the *quantitas separata* of the Schoolmen cannot be conceived as a strictly identical, ever ready, and purely static reality.[48]

y) The Church, in teaching that the Eucharistic accidents continue to exist without a subject, does not wish to restrict Catholics to any particular view of natural philosophy, nor does she compel her theologians to base their teaching on medieval physics. All that she demands is that they eschew such theories as openly contradict her teaching and are at the same time repugnant to experience and sound reason, *e. g.* Pantheism, which deifies nature, Hylozoism (Panpsychism) in its different forms (the Monadism of Leibniz, the Voluntarism of Schopenhauer and Wundt, the "Philosophy of the Unconscious" of Eduard von Hartmann), Monism, Cartesianism, etc.[49]

4. The Relation of the Eucharistic Species to the Body of Christ and the Mode of Predication Resulting Therefrom.—We have seen that in the Blessed Sacrament the Body and Blood of Christ is present under the appearances of bread and wine. How are reality and appearance united? Upon the answer to this question will depend the Eucharistic law of predication, i. *e.* the correct way of speaking of the Body and

«β Cfr. G. C. Ubagbs. *Du Dynamisme dons ses Rapports avec la Sainte Eucharistie,* Louvain 1861,

«» Cfr. Gutberlet, *Waturphilosophie,* 3rd cd., pp. 5 sqq. Munster

Blood of our Lord in their relation to the accidents of bread and wine.[50]

a) What are the mutual relations between Christ in the Blessed Sacrament and the Eucharistic species? In answering this question we must beware of two extremes.

The first of these is the assumption of a physical union between Christ and the Eucharistic accidents. This is impossible because the accidents of bread and wine cannot become accidents of Christ's Body and Blood, nor are they capable of entering into a Hypostatic Union with His Person.

The other false extreme against which we must guard is that the body of Christ, in consequence of a positive divine command, is united in a merely external way with the place in which the consecrated host happens to be.[81] This view imperils the unity of the Holy Eucharist, makes it impossible to adore the host as such,[83] and difficult to explain why the Sacred Body invariably accompanies the consecrated host. Some say that Christ voluntarily follows the host wherever it is carried. If this is true, the union existing between the Sacred Body of Christ and the Eucharistic species must be more than purely local.

But if it is neither physical nor purely local, how are we to conceive this union?

Oswald says it is a "relation of dependence," which is a correct description but affords no explanation. Other theologians define the union between Christ and

[50] On predication in general see Pohlc-Preuss. *Christology.* pp. 186 sqq.

[81] This view was defended by Duns Scotus. #3 K *lupra,* pp. ij6

the Eucharistic accidents as a *unio physica effectiva,* because the preservation of the substanceless accidents is due not directly to God but to a miraculous power proceeding from the Eucharistic Body of Christ, which supports the appearances bereft of their natural substances and preserves them from collapse.[113]

b) This sacramental union (as it had best be called) between the Eucharistic Body of our Lord and the appearances of bread and wine results in a sort of communication of idioms,[04] from which the following rules of predication may be deduced:

(i) Predicates which suppose a physical union between Christ's Body and the Eucharistic accidents must not be transferred from the latter to the former. Hence it would be wrong to say: "The Body of Christ is round, tastes sweet, looks white," etc., or: "The Blood of Christ has a light color, tastes like sour wine, quenches the thirst," etc. These predicates apply to the Eucharistic species exclusively. The chief offenders against this rule were the so-called Stercoranists, who were charged with believing that the Body of the Lord is digested and excreted *{stercus,* excrement) like any other food. Whether Stercoranism has ever had adherents within the Catholic pale is somewhat doubtful. Among those charged with this absurdity were Origen and Rhabanus Maurus, but in either case the accusation seems to be based upon a misunderstanding. Other Catholic writers suspected of Stercoranist views were Bishop Heribald

63 This is more fully explained by De Lugo, *De Euchar.,* disp. 6, sect 1 sqq-

6» *I'.* Pohlc-Prcuss. *Christology,* pp. 184 sqq.

of Auxerre (+ 857), Amalarius of Metz (-f- about 857), and the Greek Nicetas (4- about 1050). During the time of the Protestant Reformation the charge was sophistically urged by the Calvinists against their Lutheran opponents/[15]

(2) Predicates based upon the sacramental union may be indiscriminately applied to the Body of our Lord and to the Eucharistic species. This rule is founded upon the unity of the Sacrament. Hence it is correct to say: "The Body of Christ is eaten by the faithful," "The Sacred Body is carried around in procession," etc.

(3) Such predicates as move along a middle line may be applied to the Eucharistic species only in an improper or a figurative sense. In doubtful cases it is best to follow the custom of the Church, the Fathers, and reputable theologians. The graphic formula to which Berengarius was compelled to subscribe, in 1079,[M] was modeled upon the language of St. Chrysostom and other Fathers. Such expressions as, "The Body is commingled with the Blood," or, "If the Blood freezes in the chalice,"[57] are permissible, though in their literal and proper sense the affirmations contained therein apply to the species only.[08]

B5 Cfr. C. M. Pfaff, *De Stereoranislis,* Tubingen 1750. For further bibliographical data see the *New Schaff-Henog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* Vol. XI. p. 86.

se " *Rerum corpus lesu Chrisli in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus*

67 *Rubric. Missal., De Defect.,* X.

a» Cfr. De Lugo. *Do Euchar.,* disp. 6. sect. 3; Hcinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmat. Thao!.,* VoL IX. f 54a.

SECTION 2

SECOND APPARENT CONTRADICTION: THE SPIRIT-LIKE MODE OF EXISTENCE OF CHRIST'S EUCHARISTIC BODY

1. State of the Question.—It is of faith that the Body of Christ is really, truly, and substantially present in the Holy Eucharist under the species of bread.

It is also of faith that the Body of Christ is present in its entirety in the whole of the sacred Host and in each of its parts, in a manner similar to that in which the human soul is present in the body.

This teaching quite naturally gives rise to a difficulty: How can a material body exist after the manner of spirits *(ad modum spirituum)* without losing its quantity, form, etc.?

The difficulty is enhanced by the consideration that there is no question here of the Soul or the Divinity of Christ, but of His Body, which, with its head, trunk, and members, assumes a mode of existence spirit-like and independent of space. About such a mode of existence neither experience nor philosophy can give us the least information. Not even the glorified body of our Saviour after the Resurrection, though in more than one

respect itself a *σώμα πναψατικόν,* can give us an inkling in regard to the mode of existence proper to the Eucharistic Body. Christ, at the Last Supper, transferred His mortal and passible body, as yet unglorified, into that sacramental mode of existence which has no counterpart even in the supernatural order of things.[1] Even the separability of quantity from substance[2][3] gives us no clue to the solution of the present problem, since according to the best-founded opinions,[8] not only the substance of Christ's Body, but its corporeal quantity (conceived as distinct from the Body) is present within the diminutive limits of the Host and in each portion thereof.[4]* Varignon, Rossignol, Legrand, and other theologians have resorted to the explanation that Christ is present in diminished form and stature, in a sort of miniature body; while Oswald, Casajoana, Fernandez, and others assume with no better sense of fitness the mutual compénétration of the members of Christ's Body to within the narrow compass of a pin-point. The Scholastics rejected both these opinions.® The vagaries of the Cartesians, however, exceeded all bounds. This school was hard put to reconcile its theory of actual extension as the essence of material bodies with the dogma of the totality of the Real Presence. Descartes himself, in two letters to Père Mesland," expressed the opinion that only the Soul of Christ becomes present in the Eucharistic species, and that the identity of the Eucharistic Body with the heav-

1 Cfr. St Thomas, *Summa Thcol.,* 3a, qu. 81, art 3.

2 *V.* Sect 1, *supra.*

3 Against Durandus.

4 Cfr. St Bonaventure, *Comment, in Sent,* IV, diet 10, p. 1, qu. a: *"Quamvis substantia possit abstrahi a quantitate, tamen quod corpus vivat et sil organicum el non sit quantum, hoc nec esse nec intellegi potest."*

a Toietus «aye *(Comment, in S. Th.,* III, qu. 76. art. 4): *"Itta sententia conatur mysterium ad suum captum trahere, in quo decipitur. quia corpus Christi esset modo ridiculo."*

e Edit Emery, Paria 1811.

enly Body of Christ is preserved by the identity of His Soul, which animates both bodies and their quantities. This monstrous notion was vigorously combated by Arnauld, Bossuet, Fabri, Viogné, and other contemporary theologians. The geometrician Varignon attempted to improve upon Descartes' theory by suggesting that the consecration and the subsequent breaking of the Eucharistic species results in a true multiplication of the Eucharistic Bodies upon earth, which are faithful, though greatly reduced miniature copies of their prototype, *i. e.* Christ's heavenly Body. Consecration itself, he said, effects the conversion of bread and wine into organic bodies, and it is precisely in this that Transubstantiation essentially consists.[7]

The genuine teaching of Catholic theology as against these vagaries is voiced thus by St. Thomas: "Since the substance of Christ's Body is not really deprived of its dimensive quantity and its other accidents, it follows that by reason of real concomitance the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's Body and all its other accidents are in this Sacrament."[8]

As ours is an age of what may be termed hypergeometrical speculation, it may not be amiss to add that the modern theory of «-dimensions throws no light on this subject. For the Body of Christ is not invisible or impalpable to us because it occupies the fourth dimension, but because it transcends space and is wholly independent of it.

Here lies the second antinomy or apparent contradic-

[7] Cfr. J. Souben, *Nouvelle Théologie Dogmatique,* Vol. VII, pp. 118 sqq., Paris 1905.

[8] Summo *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 76, art. 4: *"Quia substantia corporis Christi realiter non dividitur* o «uu *quantitate dimensiva et ab aliis accidentibus, inde est quod ex vi realis concomitantiae esi in hoc sacramento tota quantitas dimensiva corporis Christi et omnia accidentia eius."*

tion which we are attempting to solve. We must always remember that the mode of existence peculiar to the Eucharistic Body of Our Lord does not come within the scope of physics or mechanics, but belongs as strictly to the supernatural order as the virgin birth of Christ, His resurrection from a sealed tomb, His transfiguration, etc.[9] As these examples show, there is a " mechanics of the supernatural," the laws of which do not agree with those of ordinary human experience.[10] It is necessary also, in solving the problem under consideration, to adhere firmly to the truth of the real and genuine corporeity of Christ's Eucharistic Body. There is in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar neither a conversion of matter into spirit, nor a separation of dimensive quantity from substance. The problem may therefore be formulated thus: How can divisible and extended matter and a normally constituted organism exist in a spatially uncircumscribed manner, such as is peculiar to immaterial souls and pure spirits?

2. Scholastic Solution of the Problem.— The Schoolmen (notably Suarez, Bellarmine, De Lugo, Ysambert, Lessius, and Billuart) offer the follotving solution: Quantity is either internal or external. Internal quantity *(quantitas interna s. in actu primo)* is that entity by virtue of which a corporeal substance merely possesses aptitudinal extension, *i. e.* the capability of being extended in tri-dimensional space. External quantity *(quantitas externa s. in actu secundo),* on the

[9] *dr.* i Cor. XV, 36 sqq.
[10] Cfr. Bellarmine, *De Eueharistia,* III, 6.

other hand, is the same entity in so far as it follows its natural tendency to occupy space and actually extends itself in the three dimensions. While aptitudinal extension or internal quantity is so bound up with the essences of bodies that its separability from them would involve a metaphysical contradiction, external quantity is only a natural consequence and effect, which can be suspended or withheld by the First Cause, so that the corporeal substance, retaining its internal quantity, does not actually extend itself into space.

a) Though in itself the mere substance of the Body of Christ could exist in the Blessed Sacrament without any quantity at all, just as the quantity of the bread exists without its substance,[11] yet it is theologically certain that in matter of fact the Body is entirely present with its whole quantity.[12] If quantity is present, there must be bodily extension *(positio partium extra partes),* for it is in this that quantity essentially consists. Now this extension is not actual; it is merely aptitudinal, *i. e.* capable of being actually extended in the three dimensions, but prevented from being so by the omnipotence of God. In other words, the sacred Body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist possesses internal but it does not possess external quantity. Both aptitudinal and actual extension are formal effects of quantity as such, though in a different way. The one is primary and essential, the other secondary and non-essential. The one is the principle and cause, the other a consequence and an effect. Internal quantity belongs *per reductionem* to the Aristotelian cate-

11 K Sect, i, *supra.* 12 K. No. i, *supra.*

gory of *quantum* (ποσόν), while external quantity appertains to that of *situs (κάσθαι).* The former can exist without the latter, but not *vice versa.* Hence the two are distinct and separable. While the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is prevented by the First Cause from exercising its natural tendency to occupy space, it nevertheless exists wholly and with its full size, without however extending itself through space."

By way of illustration we may refer to the miracle of the three children in the furnace. In preserving them from harm, God did not interfere with the essence of the fire into which they were cast, but merely suspended its natural effects. In a similar manner. He does not destroy the essence of quantity in the Holy Eucharist, but merely suspends one of its natural effects, *i. e.* extension in space.

The distinction between internal and external quantity may be brought nearer to the human mind by a consideration taken from higher mathematics. In applying the infinitesimal calculus, mathematicians deal not only with finite but likewise with infinitesimally small quantities, *i. e.,* quantities that may be made as small as we please without affecting the use to which they are to be

13 The trile objection: *"Corpus Christi in Eucharistia foret sins quantitate,"* is answered by Billuart as follows *(De Eucharistia,* diss. 1, art. 4, § 3): *" Quoad primanum* ein.r *effectum, nego; quoad secun- effectum, concedo. Primarius effectus quantitatis est ordine aJ se et in toto; secundarius in ordine ad locum. Prius est enim quantitatem extendi in se quam extendi in loco, quam esse impenetrabilem, divisibilem, etc. Unde quaerenti, cur quantitas sit extenso recte respondetur quia est extensa in se; quaerenti vero, cur sit extensa* in *se, nulla est ratio prior quam quia est quantitas. Porro potest effectus secundarius quantitatis divinitus ab ipsa separan, prout de facto separatus est, quando Christus exivit er utero virginali clauso et de sepulcro non revoluto lapide, item quando intravit ad diseiputos ianuis clausis. Et ita separatur in Eucharistia."*

put. Now a triangle so infinitesimally small that its dimensions can be conceived only by the mind, may be called an " internal figure," because it shrinks together to a point, and can no longer be represented as two-dimensional on a plain surface. Of course, the analogy with the Holy Eucharist is not perfect, because such a triangle, even though merely imaginary, always remains a true spatial figure.14*

b) What we have just said of bodies in general, applies also to organisms, for an organism is merely a body (a) composed of different organs or parts, (b) disposed in orderly fashion, and (c) subserving the functions of life. The first mark (a) distinguishes an organism (plant, beast, man) from homogenous masses of matter (minerals) ; the second (b) distinguishes it from monstrosities, and the third (c) produces that organic unity which, assuming the principle of animation, guarantees the capacity to live. All three of these conditions are present in the Eucharistic Body of Christ, even though it lacks external quantity. Even a living organism need not occupy tri-dimensional space simply because it is composed of heterogeneous parts arranged in an orderly manner. Both in reality and notionally the internal disposition of the body precedes its external formation, which is bound to space and extends itself into it. " There is no confusion here," says St. Bonaventure, " because, although the parts are not distinct according to their position in space, they are distinct according to their position in the whole, and consequently there is no confusion because there is position, which is the orderly arrangement of parts in a whole." 16

14 For the solution of this and other dialectic difficulties see Tepe, Znrt *Theol.,* Vol. IV, pp. 243 sqq.

IB Comment *i„ Sent.,* IV, dist. »0, p. I, qu. 4: *"Non est ibi confusio, quia etsi fartes non distin-*

c) The profounclest treatment of the subject is offered by St. Thomas, who traces the mode of existence peculiar to the Eucharistic Body to Transubstantiation, for the reason that a thing must "be" such as it was in "becoming."

How does the Body of Christ become present in the Eucharist by Transubstantiation? The Angelic Doctor answers this question as follows: "Since the substance of Christ's Body is present on the altar by the power of this Sacrament [/. *e.* by virtue of the words of consecration], while its dimensive quantity is there concomitantly and as it were accidentally, therefore the dimensive quantity of Christ's body is in this Sacrament not according to its proper manner [i. *e.* quantitatively, the whole in the whole and the individual parts in individual parts], but after the manner of substance, whose nature is to be whole in the whole, and whole in every part." ,e Since *ex vi verborum* only the substance of Christ's Body is present, and not its quantity,17 therefore the Body is present after the manner of a substance and not after the manner of a quantity, and consequently the Body of Christ is present in the Sacred Host unextended and indivisible. Quantity being merely present *per concomitantium,* must follow the mode of existence peculiar to its substance, and, like the latter, must exist without di-

guantur secundum positionem in loco, distinguuntur tamen secundum positionem in toto, et ideo non est ibi confusio, quia est ibi positio, quae est ordinatio partium in toto." Cfr. Franzelin. *De Eucharistia,* thes.

>e *Summa Theol.,* ja, qu. *76,* art. 4, ad 1: *"Quia er vi huius sacramenti est* in *altari substantia corporis Christi, quantitas autem dimensiva* rinr *esi ibi concomitanter sacramento non secundum proprium nodum, sed per modum substantiae. cuius naturo est tota in toto et iota* in *qualibet parte."*

it Cfr. *Cone. Trident.* Se*. XIII,

vision and extension, *i. c.* entire in the whole Host and entire in each part thereof. In other words, as before the consecration the substance of bread was present in the whole and in all its parts under its own dimensions, so after the consecration there is present *vi verborum,* in the whole and in all its parts, first, the substance of the Body, and then, *per concomifantiam,* the full quantity of that Body, but under the foreign dimensions of the species of bread. And since the internal dimensions of Christ's Body are incommensurable with the external dimensions of the species, there is no common standard by which they could be measured. While the species occupy space and extend themselves in the three dimensions, the Body of Christ hidden beneath them remains unextended, transcending space and wholly independent of it.[18]

d) The above explanation quite naturally gives rise to the question: Can the Eucharistic Body of Christ be said to be present in space? The dogmatic teaching of the Church that the Body of Christ is really and truly present in the Sacred Host decides this question in the affirmative.

Hence what we have said above on the spirit-like and invisible existence of that Body in the Eucharist, does not touch the Real Presence as such, but merely its mode of existence.

Philosophy distinguishes in creatures two modes of presence: (i) the circumscriptive and (2) the definitive. The first, the only mode of presence proper to bodies, is that by virtue of which an object is restricted

18 Cfr. Gihr, *Die hl. Sakramenle der hath. Kirche,* Vol. I, and cd,, { *62*

to a defined portion of space in such wise that its various parts also occupy their corresponding positions in that space. From what we have said above it is evident that Christ's Body is not circumscriptively present in the Sacred Host. "Christ's Body is not in this sacrament circumscriptively," says St. Thomas, "because it is not there according to the commensuration of its own quantity." [19]

The second mode of presence, that properly belonging to spiritual beings, requires that the substance of a thing exist in its entirety in the whole of the space as well as whole and entire in each part of that space. This is the soul's mode of presence in the human body. As it also applies to the Eucharistic Body, we may say, as not a few theologians do, that the Body of Christ is definitively present in the Sacred Host. But we should not be permitted to say that Christ's Body is present only in one place, because, as a matter of fact, it is truly present in Heaven and on thousands of altars. It is in this sense that St. Thomas says that "Christ's Body is not in this sacrament definitively, because then it would be only on the particular altar where this Sacrament is performed; whereas it is in Heaven under its own species, and on many other altars under the sacramental species." [90]

3. Theological Corollaries.—From the peculiar manner in which Christ's Body is pres-

10 Summa Theol., 3a, qu. *76,* art. 5, ad 1: *"Patet quod corpus Christi non est ibi circumscriptive, quia non est ibi fecundum commensurationem propriae quantitatif."*

20 5uni»ia *Theol.,* 3a. qu. 76, art. 5. ad 1: *"Corpus Christi non est* tn *hoc sacramento definitive, quia sic non esset alibi quam in hoe altari, ubi conficitur hoc sacramentum, quum tamen sit in coelo in propria specie ei in multis aliis altaribus sub specie sacramenti."* Cfr. G. Reinhold, *Die Lehre son der Srtlichen Cegenurart Christi in der Eucharistie beim H. Thomas von Aquin,* Vienna 1893.

ent in the Eucharist there follow certain interesting and important corollaries, the value of which, on the whole, does not exceed that of theological conclusions.

a) In the first place it is certain that the Eucharistic Body cannot be physically injured, not only because, being glorified, it is impassible, but likewise because of its sacramental mode of existence.[21] Intimately connected with this quality is the imperceptibility of the Body. As it lacks actual extension, it does not fall under the senses.

Can the human eye in the glorified state be capacitated for a supernatural vision of the Eucharistic Body? This question is answered in the affirmative by Vasquez[22] and De Lugo,[23] but in the negative by St. Thomas and Suarez.[24] "Christ's Body," says the Angelic Doctor, "as it is in this Sacrament, cannot be seen by any bodily eye. First of all, because a body which is visible brings about an alteration in the medium, through its accidents. Now the accidents of Christ's Body are in this Sacrament by means of the substance; so that the accidents of Christ's Body have no immediate relationship either to this Sacrament or to adjacent bodies; consequently, they do not act on the medium so as to be seen by any corporeal eye. Secondly, because . . . Christ's Body is substantially present in this Sacrament. But substance, as such, is not visible to the bodily eye, nor does it come under any one of the senses, nor under the imagination, but solely under the intellect, whose object is *what a thing is.*"[20]

21 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 53. ·«=*· 2·

ŸŸ Comiihmiî. til Summam *Theft.,* HI, disp. 19«. e· 2·

2B *De Eucharistia,* disp. 9, sect, a, ". 20 «Ul·

24 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 53, sect. 4·

2B Summa *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 76, art.

b) Another theological conclusion of even greater importance, which is held by all Catholic divines with the sole exception of the Nominalist school, is that Christ in the Holy Eucharist is unable to use His limbs or to employ His external senses. The reason is that bodily movement and sense perception presuppose tri-dimensional extension *(quantitas in loco s. externa),* which the Eucharistic Body lacks. Hence, naturally speaking, Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament can neither see nor hear nor speak, nor move His own Body or those of others. The question has been raised whether, by a new miracle, He could give back to Himself the supernatural use of sight and hearing. There is no intrinsic contradiction in the assumption that God may supply the external causal influence of color and sound or raise the physiological power of Christ's eyes and ears to a higher potency.[28] It is quite another question whether Christ actually exercises such sense functions, ». *e.,* whether He actually sees those who kneel before Him in the Blessed Sacrament and actually hears their prayers. Most theologians deny this. Those few who affirm it are compelled to assume a new miracle.[27] Cardinal Cicnfuegos, in a learned treatise entitled *Vita Abscondita sub Speciebus Velata,*[28] argues that our Divine Saviour empowers His sacramental Body to see and hear, in order not to be limited to a purely spiritual intercourse with His faithful children but to be able to see and hear them as they appear before the Sacred Host to adore Him. As this assumption is not impossible and conforms both to the dig-

20 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. S3· sect. 3-

27 Among them are St Bonaventure. Ysambert, Lessius, Tanner, Franzelin, Dalgairns. Gihr, etc. St. Bonaventure says *{Comment, in Sent.,* IV, dist. 10, p. I, qu. z): *"Corpus Christi tire Christru* ‹M *tide! et audit, quamrie non loquatur, ne deprehendatur."*

28 Published in Rome, A. D. 1728.

nity of Christ's sacred Humanity and the sublime purpose of the Blessed Sacrament, it may be entertained as *"sententia probabilissima et pia."* However, Cardinal Franzelin, who thus qualifies it, rightly warns against the misunderstanding as if without this hypothesis the Eucharistic Body would be lifeless and stolid, or as if our Divine Lord, unless He endowed His sacramental Body with this miraculous power, would remain unacquainted with our inmost thoughts, wishes, and prayers. He in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells, knows all things, past, present, and future, as man no less than as God, by a higher form of perception than that exercised through the bodily senses.

SECTION 3

THIRD APPARENT CONTRADICTION: THE SIMULTANEOUS EXISTENCE OF CHRIST IN HEAVEN AND IN MANY PLACES ON EARTH (multilocation)

I. Multilocation Defined.—In the natural order of things a body is restricted to one position in space *(unilocatio).* This is true also of every finite being (soul, spirit) which enters into relation with space.

a) If an object be conceived as simultaneously present in two, three, or more places, we have bilocation, trilocation, etc., as the case may be. Multilocation, though outside of the natural order, involves no intrinsic contradiction. The objection that "no being can exist separated from itself or with local distances between its various selves" is a sophism; for multilocation does not multiply the object but only its external relation to and presence in space. Multilocation may therefore be defined as "the simultaneous presence of an object in several places."

b) An object may be simultaneously present in several places in one of four different ways:

a) It may be definitively present with its substance not only in one particular point of space, but continu-

es

ously beyond that point throughout a certain determinate portion of space, as the soul in the body. This is called continuous multilocation or replication *(multilocatio continua s. replicatio')*.

β) An object may be definitively and simultaneously present in several separate places, as would be the case if a departed soul appeared on earth by a virtual extension of substance. This is called discontinuous multilocation *(multilocatio discreta rei definitive praesentis)*.

y) An object existing circumscriptively, *i. e.* a body in its natural state, may exist simultaneously in different places, as when divine omnipotence were to create the impression of a forest by the multilocation of a tree. This is called discontinuous circumscriptive multilocation *(multilocatio discreta circumscriptiva)*.

8) A body may exist circumscriptively in one place and definitively in another, as would be the case if God were to cause a person who exists circumscriptively in Paris, to exist at the same time definitively at Rome. This is known as mixed multilocation *(multilocatio mixta* f. *praesentia eiusdem rei circumscriptiva in uno loco, definitiva in alio)*.

The three last-mentioned species of multilocation are plainly supernatural and can be brought about only by a miracle.

2. The Multilocation of the Body of Christ in Heaven and Upon Thousands of Altars Throughout the World.—In the mystery of the Holy Eucharist we have exemplified all these different species of multilocation, with one exception.

There is, in the first place, continuous multilocation or replication. For the Body of Christ is present in the Sacred Host *per replicationem continuam, ». e.* it is totally present, as the soul in the body, in each part of the continuous and as yet unbroken Host, and also totally present throughout the whole Host, just as the human soul is present in the body.

There is, in the second place, discontinuous multilocation, as Christ is present not only in one Host, but in numberless separate Hosts, whether in the ciborium or upon different altars. It is not a case of the multilocation of one Host. There are as many consecrated Hosts as particles of bread were consecrated, and yet it is one and the same Body of Christ that is really and truly present in them all.

There is, third, mixed multilocation, since Christ with His natural dimensions reigns in Heaven, whence He does not depart, and at the same time dwells in sacramental presence on numberless altars throughout the world.

It is an article of faith that the Eucharistic Body of Christ is endowed with these three kinds of multilocation.

In the case of the first mentioned kind, however, the distinction between *ante et post separationem* must be duly noticed.[1]

The fact of the Eucharistic multilocation proves that it is possible. The Tridentine Council says: ‘‘For neither are these things mutually repugnant,— that our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in Heaven, according to the natural mode of existing *[circumscriptive],* and that, nevertheless, He be, in many other places, sacramentally present *[definitive]* to

1 *V. supra,* p. 98.

us in His own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet by the understanding illuminated by faith, we can conceive, and ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God."[1] Encouraged by this pronouncement, speculative theology, with due precaution against the disturbing influence of the imagination, attempts to clear up the mystery with the torch of philosophy and to show at least that multilocation involves no intrinsic contradiction.

3. The Philosophic Possibility of Multilocation.—Though the fourth species of multilocation is not verified in the Holy Eucharist, it will be necessary to discuss it in connection with the other three, for the reason that its denial involves a denial of mixed multilocation and, besides, it seems to have played an important rôle in the lives of some of the saints.

a) The continuous definitive multilocation, also called replication, whereby the Body of Christ is totally present in each part of the continuous and as yet unbroken Host, and also totally present throughout the whole Host, is easiest to understand because it has a splendid analogy in the presence of the human soul in the body.[3]

[1] *Cone. Trid.,* Sees. XIII, cap. 1: "*Neque enim haec* infer je *repugnant, ul ipse Salvator noster semper ad dextram Patris* in *coelis assideat iuxla modum existendi naturalem* [i. e. circnmjeri/ifive], *et lll* niiillij *nihilominus aliis* in *locis sacramcntaliter praesens* [i. *e. definitive} sua substantia nobis adsit ea existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo cogitatione per fidem illustrata assequi possumus et constantissime credere debemus.*" (Denxingcr-Bannwart n. 874).

[3] *V. supra,* Ch. II, thes. 4.

The soul is present with the totality of its substance in each part of the body, in the head, the trunk, the feet, the arms, etc. It is true that in the Eucharist there is a replication not only of the soul, but also and principali) of the Body, whose natural manner of existence is not spiritual but circumscriptive. Since in the natural order of things each body is restricted to one position in space, so that before the law the proof of an alibi immediately frees a person from the suspicion of crime, the continuous multilocation of the Eucharistic Body of our Lord within the Sacred Host is doubtless an astonishing miracle of divine omnipotence. Yet it is made somewhat intelligible to us by the proof that God in His omnipotence can supernaturally impart to a body such a spirit-like, unextended, spatially uncircumscribed mode of presence as is natural to the soul in regard to the human body.

b) The intrinsic possibility of discontinuous multilocation is based on the non-repugnance of continuous multilocation.

The chief difficulty of the former appears to be that the same Christ with the totality of His substance and quantity is present in two different parts of space, A and B, of the continuous Host,— it being immaterial whether we consider the two points A and B connected by a continuous line or not. The miracle is contained in the fact that the (inadequate) presences of the Body are divided by the distance of the line AB. Nor does it matter how great that distance may be. Whether or not the fragments of the Host are distant one inch or a thousand miles from one another, is altogether immaterial from

this point of view. Just as the soul does not become two individuals in consequence of its dwelling whole and entire in the head as well as in the toes of a man, the Body of Christ in the Eucharist docs not become several individuals in consequence of the fact that it dwells simultaneously in tabernacles at Rome, Paris, London, and Jerusalem.[4]

c) The difficulty becomes more complicated if we consider that Christ with His natural dimensions reigns in Heaven and at the same time dwells with His sacramental presence in numberless hosts on earth.

Is such a mixed multilocation possible? This case would be in perfect accordance with the foregoing were we *per impossibile* permitted to imagine that Christ were present in Heaven not *in specie propria,* but *in specie aliena, i. e.* under the form of bread, exactly as He is present in the Holy Eucharist. This, however, would be but one more marvel of God's omnipotence, because the circumscriptive mode of presence is as natural to the celestial Christ as the definitive mode of presence is supernatural. As the matter lies, we have simply one miracle less. But since the celestial Christ, despite His natural form, is individually identical with the Christ who is present in numberless Hosts on earth, there can be no contradiction in the fact that He retains His natural dimensional relations in Heaven and at the same time dwells sacramentally on earth ; for a different mode of existence no more destroys the individual unity and

4 The objections against the *multilocatio discreta* in general are well treated by H. Haan, S. J.. *Philosophia Naturalis,* pp. 44 sqq., Freiburg 1906, and by Tilmann Pesch, S. J., *Philosophia Naturalis,* ad ed., pp. 5x7 sq., Freiburg 1897.

identity of a subject than a difference of presence in space.[0]

d) We might pass over the fourth and last species of multilocation *(multilocatio circumscriptiva)* as foreign to our subject, were it not for the circumstance that a discussion of it is apt to throw some light on the Holy Eucharist.

a) De Lugo[e] shows that nearly all the objections raised against circumscriptive multilocation can be urged also against definitive multilocation. It is advisable, too, to pay some attention to the many cases of bilocation occurring in the legends of the saints. Some of them no doubt were nothing more than subjective apparitions. Others, however, can hardly be explained otherwise than by circumscriptive multilocation. Take, *e. g.,* the miracle that occurred in the conversion of St. Paul before the gates of Damascus, when Christ appeared in person and said to him: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"[T] Withal, it is an obscure problem with which we are dealing, one involved in so many intrinsic difficulties that St. Thomas and other eminent theologians[8] do not hesitate to admit that circumscriptive multilocation involves open contradictions. Others, however, notably Alexander of Hales, Duns Scotus,[®] Bellarmine, Suarez, and De Lugo, maintain its intrinsic possibility. The controversy is still unsettled. Of modem theologians Sanseverino. De San, Michael de Maria, Schneid, and others share the

6 *V. supra,* No. i.

e *De Eucharistia,* disp. $, sect, i n. is.

T Cfr. Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* HI. 3‹

8 Si. Thomas *(Comment,* in *Sent* IV. dist. 44, qu, *1.* art. *1; Quadlib-.* qu. 3, art. a), Henry of Ghent, Capreolus, Francis of Ferrara. Vaaquer, Sylvester Maurus *et al.*

v Comment, in *Sent.,* IV. dirt.

view of Aquinas, while Franzelin, Tilmann Pesch, Gutberlet, Haan, Lahousse, etc., uphold the possibility of circumscriptive multilocation. If there were question of the vagaries of many Nominalists, as, *e. g.,* that a bilocated person could be living in Rome and at the same time dying in Naples, or be acquitted in Paris and simultaneously condemned in London, the impossibility would be obvious, and we should have to thank the Thomists for bringing about a reaction, though they undoubtedly went too far in denying the possibility of circumscriptive multilocation altogether.[10]

/3) In order to clear up the existing confusion on the subject it is necessary to draw a clear-cut distinction between two different groups of determinations. Some belong to a bilocated individual absolutely, *i. e.* without regard to external circumstances *(e. g.,* life, intelligence, reason, health, etc.), while others belong to him only in a relative manner, *i. e.* in consideration of external and local circumstances (c. *g.,* position of the body in regard to the direction of the wind, difference in temperature, etc.). The leading principle with regard to all these determinations is thus set forth by Cardinal Bellarmine: "It should be noted that one body which is present in different places has one substantial existence, but many local existences. Whence it happens that all those] determinations] must be multiplied which follow the *esse locale,* not however those which originate elsewhere than in the *esse locale." [1]* It is quite evident, as

aberration we may cite Coninck, *Comment, in Summam Thcol.,* III, qu. 7S· ar*· 4. dub. 3, n. 129: *"Homo ita replicatur posset uno loco comburi ac mori, peccare el et mereri et salvari, si absolutam Dei potentiam spectemus, quia acquivalet absolute duobus hominibus."*

11 Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* III, 4: *"Notandum est, unum corpus in pluribus locis positum habere unum esse substantiale sed multa esse localia. Ex qua Ut ut*

regards the first group of determinants, that a bilocated individual cannot simultaneously assume into himself intrinsically contradictory determinants, for because of the absolute identity of the subject with itself, its intrinsic properties follow the substance, not the place in which it exists, and hence a person simultaneously present in London and Paris cannot be living in good health in one city and dying in the other, and so forth, for this would involve an intrinsic contradiction.

The case is different with the second group of determinants, *i. e.* those depending on local conditions. As these approach the bilocated subject from without, and do not affect his substance, there is no intrinsic contradiction involved in the assertion that a number of them that are contradictory to one another may affect the same individual simultaneously, though in a different respect *(sub diverso respectu).* Thus we find no contradiction in the legend that the countenance of St. Alphonsus in Santa Agata was turned to the north, while in Naples it looked towards the south.

Sylvester Maurus expressed the apprehension that to admit the possibility of circumscriptive multilocation would endanger the empiric certainty regarding the real distinction between homogeneous natural bodies. Thus one would never be sure whether he had before him a single tree or a grove, and so forth. But this apprehension is unfounded. For, in the first place, a miracle is never to be presumed except on the strictest evidence. Then, we perceive the difference between similarly constituted bodies not only from their different positions in space, but likewise and mainly from the differences existing in their individual determinants, properties, acci-

illa omnia multiplicari debeant, quae coneequuntur cue locale, illa autem non multiplicentur, quae aliunde proveniunt quam et eut locali."

dents, etc. There was probably never a forester who feared that if he felled one tree, the entire forest would come down as if by magic.12

Readings: —St. Thomas, *Summa Theol., 3a,* qu. 75 sqq.— Idem, *Contra Gent.,* IV, 62 sqq.—Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* diss. I, art. 5 sqq.—*Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 47.— Bellannine, *De Eucharistia,* TIT, 18 sqq — Lessius, *De Perfect. Moribusque Divinis,* XII, 16.—*De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 5 sq., 8 sqq.

Among modern authors the student may consult: Fr. X. Wildt, *Explanatio Mirabilium, quae Divinâ Potentia in Eucharistiae Sacramento Operantur,* Bonn 1868; G. Reinhold, *Die Lehre von der ôrtlichen Gegenwart Christi in der Eucharistie bcim hl. Thomas von Aquin,* Vienna 1893.—Oswald, *Die dogmatische Lehre von den hl. Sakramenten,* Vol. I, 5th ed., § 9-10, Munster 1894.— Schechen, *Die Mysterien des Christentums,* 3rd ed., 6 69 sqq., Freiburg 1912.—*Heinrich-Gutber1et, *Dogmatische Théologie,* Vol. IX, § 538 sqq., Mayence 1901.—Scheeben-Atzberger, *liandbuch der hath. Dogmatik,* Vol. IV, 2, § 372, Freiburg 1901.—N. Gihr, *Die hl. Sakramcnte der kath. Kirche,* Vol. Γ, 2nd ed., § 62 sqq., Freiburg 1902.— Hourcade, *"Autour du Problème Eucharistique,"* in the *Bulletin de Literature Ecclésiastique,* 1905, pp. 267 sqq.—D. Coghlan, *De SS. Eucharistia,* Dublin 1913.— J. M. Piecirelli, S. J., *Disquisitio Dogmatica, Critica, Scholastica, Polemica de Catholico Intellectu Dogmatis Transsubstantiations,* Naples 1912.— Jansen, S. J., art. *"Eucharistiques (Accidents)"* in the *Diet, de Théol. Catholique.*

12 Cfr. Gutberlet, *Allgemeine Melaphyslk,* 4th ed., § 30, Miinster 1906.

PART II

THE HOLY EUCHARIST AS A SACRAMENT

That the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrament follows from the fact that it is a visible sign of invisible grace instituted by Jesus Christ. It has been so regarded through all the centuries of the Christian Church.

I. The question as to the precise nature of this Sacrament is beset with many difficulties.

The essence of the Holy Eucharist does not consist in the Consecration, nor in the Communion, since the former is a sacrificial action, while the latter is merely the reception of the Sacrament, not the Sacrament itself.[1] The question eventually reduces itself to this: Is the sacramentality of the Eucharist to be sought for in the Eucharistic species as such, or in the Body and Blood of Christ hidden beneath them? The majority of theologians respond in the words of Deharbe's Catechism: "The Holy Eucharist is the true Body and the true Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is really and substantially present under the appearances of bread and wine for the nourishment of our souls." Hence the Sacrament consists not in the Eucharistic species as such, nor in the Body or Blood of Christ alone, but in the union of both in one moral whole. The species undoubtedly

1 Cfr. *Catechismus Romanus, Dt Eucharistia.* qu. 8.

belong to the essence of the Sacrament, since it is by means of them, and not by means of the invisible Body of Christ, that the Eucharist becomes the outward sign of invisible grace.[2] Equally certain it is that the Body and Blood of Christ are of the essence of the Sacrament, because it is not the mere unsubstantial appearances that are given for the nourishment of our souls, but Christ concealed beneath them.[8] Furthermore, it is only on account of the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament that we are allowed and in duty bound to adore it.*

2. The definition we have quoted from Deharbe is, however, incomplete, as it makes no mention of the sacramental form. This can only consist in the words of Consecration, and hence the Scotists are in error when they say that the words of Consecration do not enter into the intrinsic form of the Sacrament but merely cause it to exist.[6]* Their theory can easily be disproved. It is only by means of the words of Consecration that the Eucharistic species become a visible sign of the Body and Blood of Christ and of the graces effected in holy Communion. Consequently, the words of Consecration, considered as morally continuing their effect, constitute the sacramental form of the Holy Eucharist."

2 Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Sesa. XIII, cap. 3.

8 Cfr. John VI, 5a aqq.

4 *I', suprq,* p. 141,

c *V.* Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacramenti,* Vol. 1., pp. 64 sq.

0 Cfr. De Lugo, *De Sacramentis* in *Genere,* disp. a, sect. 7, n. 136: *"Nam corpus Christi* ibi *non est sensibile per se, sed per species et verba consecrationis; nec species solae significant sufficienter sensibiliter corpus Christi vel graham. sed oportet videre species panis, v. g. et audire vel scire prolata esse verba consecrationis super illas species, ut aliquis veniat in cognitionem corporis Christi ibi contenti et gratiae quam potest ille cibus causare: debent ergo verba intrare ut partiale constitutivum sacramenti in ratione signi sensibiliter significantis gratiam."* For a refutation of the Scotistic objections cfr. De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 1, sect.

3. To obtain an adequate principle of division for this part of our treatise, we will consider the Holy Eucharist in its three consecutive stages: *in fieri, in esse,* and *in usu sive sumptione.* In all stages there is a visible sign (matter and form), but this sign differs considerably in each. The (remote) matter of the Sacrament in *fieri* are the unconsecrated bread and wine; the form, the words of Consecration as pronounced here and now. The *materia proxima in esse* are the Eucharistic species of bread and wine in so far as they signify and contain the true Body and Blood of Christ, while the form consists in the morally enduring words of Consecration, as the phrase "*species consecratae*" indicates. Of the Sacrament *in usu sive sumptione* (Communion) the Eucharistic species constitute the remote, their consumption the proximate matter, while the form is lacking, since the accompanying words of the minister ("*Corpus Domini nostri Iesu Christi custodiat animam tuam,*" etc.) are not essential. If we say that the consumption of the sacred species is the proximate matter, we do not employ this term in a sacramental sense, because holy Communion is not a Sacrament in itself, but merely the reception of an already existing (permanent) Sacrament.

4. This gives us the basis for an adequate division of our subject-matter. Passing over the institution, which we discussed in the first part of this treatise in connection with the Real Presence, the essential point is the outward sign, *i. e.* matter and form. By matter *(materia ex qua remota)* we understand the so-called Eucharistic elements, namely, the bread and wine which arc to be converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, and by form, the words of Consecration, which effect this conversion. The "inward grace" must be identical with the effects of holy Communion, since it is only through Communion

that the recipient becomes sanctified, whereas the Consecration (or Transubstantiation) has for its sole object to make the Author of grace present under the Eucharistic species. When we say that the Holy Eucharist is necessary for salvation, we have reference to Communion, not to the Consecration performed by the priest.

In regard to the persons concerned, we distinguish between the minister of the Eucharist, *i. e.* the consecrator or dispenser, and its subject, i. *e.* the recipient of holy Communion.

The minister *conficiens* is the priest who performs the Consecration, the minister *dispensans,* he who distributes the Sacrament to the faithful.

CHAPTER I

MATTER AND FORM

SECTION I

THE MATTER, OR THE EUCHARISTIC ELEMENTS

The fact that there are two distinct Eucharistic elements, *i. e.* bread and wine, no more interferes with the unity of this Sacrament than the different stages of ordination interfere with the unity of Holy Orders.[1][2]

Sacred Scripture represents the Holy Eucharist as a celestial banquet, at which both meat and drink are dispensed.[3] Besides, the separate species of bread and wine also symbolize the mystic separation of Christ's Body and Blood, *i. e.* the slaughtering of the Eucharistic Lamb of sacrifice.[3]

i. Wheaten Bread as the First Element. —The first element of the Sacrament of the Holy

1 Cfr. the dogmatic treatise on Holy Orders.

2 Cfr. John VI, 56; 1 Cor. X, 17.

8 This symbolism is explained by St. Thomas, *Summa Thcol.,* 3a, qu. 73, art. *3,* and, with considerable detail, by Suarez, *De Euchariitia,* disp. 39› sect 3, and De Lugo, *De Euchariitia,* disp. a, *sect.* 1 sqq. The student may also consult Gihr, *Die Lehre von den hl. Sakramenten,* Vol. I, and ed., pp. 505 sqq.. and F. Schmid in the Innsbruck *Zeil· echrift far hath. Theologia.* 1903, PP· ajo sqq.

Eucharist is wheaten bread. This is theologically certain from the dogmatic *Decretum pro Armenis* of Pope Eugene IV, which says: *"Materia est panis triticeus et vinum de vite."*[4] The Roman Missal says that "without wheaten bread there is no conversion of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ." 0

Since the bread required is that made of wheaten flour, not every kind of flour is allowed, such, *e. g.,* as is ground from rye, oats, barley, Indian corn or maize, though these are all classified as grain *{frumentum).* On the other hand, the different varieties of wheat (spelt, amcl-corn, etc.) are valid matter in so far as they can be proved botanically to be genuine wheat.

The necessity of wheaten bread is deduced immediately from the words of institution : " The Lord took bread." The Greek text says: ϊλα/îe *τον άρτον.* Now in Scriptural usage άρτο , without any qualifying adjective, always signifies wheaten bread.® No doubt, too, that Christ at the Last Supper adhered to the Jewish custom of using only wheaten bread in the Passover, and by the words " Do this for a commemoration of me," commanded its use for all succeeding time.

This view is confirmed by an uninterrupted tradition, embodied in the writings of the Fathers and the constant practice of the Church. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, in comparing the Catholic Church to wheaten bread, as distinct from the inferior bread ground from barley, to which they liken the Jewish Synagogue,

4 Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 698.

» De *Defect.,* 3: *"Si fouir non* ail Iriliccur . . .. non *conficitur* zo-

« Bread made of barley flour ia called *fanie hordaccue,* or pdfa.

plainly indicate that genuine wheaten bread was considered the only valid element of the most sublime mystery of the Christian religion. St. Irenæus traces the use of wheaten bread in the Eucharist to an express command of our Lord and His Apostles.

2. The Question Regarding Unleavened Bread.—Wheaten bread can be prepared in a twofold way: either with leaven or yeast, or without it. Bread baked with yeast is called leavened *(fermentum, ζνμο*)* · bread made of wheaten flour and water without yeast, unleavened *(azyma, άζνμον').*

After the Patriarch Michael Caerularius of Constantinople had sought to palliate the renewed rupture of the Greeks with Rome by means of the controversy concerning the use of unleavened bread in the Holy Eucharist (A. D. 1053), the two Churches, in the Decree of Union adopted at Florence, in 1439, came to the decision that the question was of no dogmatic importance, but that the Latin Rite was bound to use unleavened, while the Greek might continue to use leavened bread.[7] As the validity of leavened bread has never been questioned, we may confine ourselves to a defence of the Latin custom of using unleavened bread in the Holy Eucharist.

[7] Cfr. *Cone. Flor.: "Diffinimur . . in atymo sii'e fermentato fane triticeo corfut Chrieli veraciter confici iicerdoteique* in *altera ifsum Domini corfui conficere debere. unumquemque tcil. iuxta tuae eecleriae live occidentalir rive orientant comueludinem."* (Dcazinjer-Bannwart, n. 69.»).

a) According to the synoptic gospels,[8]*the Last Supper was celebrated "on the first day of the azymes" (eV t# *Ttpiorj] τωv ἀζvμωv),* that is, at the beginning of the period of seven days during which the Jews partook exclusively of the so-called *massoth* as bread.[0] Therefore we may rightly claim that the custom of the Western Church received its solemn sanction from Christ Himself. This was pointed out as early as 1054 by Pope Leo IX in his protest against Michael Caerularius.[10][11]

The schismatic Greeks object that, according to the Fourth Gospel," our Divine Saviour celebrated the Last Supper *per anticipationem* " before the festival day of the pasch." This is refuted by Estius[12] with the remark that no doubt He also by anticipation obeyed the legal prescription regarding unleavened bread, especially since the Jews were accustomed to do away with all the leaven which chanced to be in their dwellings on the day before the fourteenth of Nisan.[13]

b) Tradition is neither very clear nor uniform on this subject. Without attempting to settle the ancient dispute whether or not in the first six or eight centuries the Latins also celebrated Mass with leavened bread,[14] or whether they have observed the present custom ever since

8 Matth. XXVI, 17; Mark XIV, 12; Luke XXII. 7.

0 Cfr. Ex. XII, 15 sqq.

10 See bis letter in Migne, *P. L.,* CXLI1I, 775-

11 Cfr. John XIII, 1.

12 Comment, in *Sent.,* IV, dist. 8, § 8.

1« Cfr. 1 Cor. V, 7.— For a harmonization of the synoptic Gospels with that of St. John on this point, see De Augustinis, *De Rc Sacramentaria,* and ed., Vol. 1, p. 631. Rome 1889; Bellarniine, *De Sacr. Euchar.,* IV, 7-9; *Chwolson, Das Ictstc Passahmahl Christi und dcr Tag seines Todcs,* St. Petersburg 1892; J. Bclser, *Die Ceschichte des Leidcns und Stcrbcns, dcr Auferstehung und Himmclfahrt des Herrn,* pp. 306 sqq., Freiburg 1903; J. Schneid, *Dcr Monatslag des Abendmahlcs mid Todcs unscrcs Herrn Jesus Christus,* Ratisbon 1905.

14 Sirmond, Dollinger, and F. X. Kraus hold that they did; Mabillon Probst, and others maintain that unleavened bread was used in the Western Church from the begin-

the time of the Apostles, we merely call attention to the fact that in the Orient the Armenians and Maronites have used unleavened bread from time immemorial and that, according to Origen,,c the people of the East "sometimes" (therefore not as a rule), made use of leavened bread in their liturgy. We may also ask how Justin Martyr10 could have regarded the unleavened bread offered by the lepers of the Old Testament as a figure of the Eucharist, if unleavened bread had not been regarded as valid matter for Consecration in his time?

c) Besides, there is considerable force in the philosophical argument that the fermenting process with yeast and other leaven does not affect the substance of the bread, but merely its quality."' Reasons of congruity can be urged in favor of either custom, though they are not, of course, decisive. The Greeks rightly maintain that leavened bread is a beautiful symbol of the Hypostatic Union, — the compénétration of Christ's humanity with the Godhead,185—as well as an attractive representation *of* the savour of this Heavenly Food. Nevertheless St. Thomas finds the Latin practice more appropriate, first, because of the example of Christ; secondly, because of the aptitude of unleavened bread to be regarded as a symbol of His pure Body, free from all corruption, and thirdly, because of St. Paul's exhortation to keep the Pasch "not with the leaven 10 of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." ■'

3. Wine of Grapes as the Second Element. —The second Eucharistic element required is

15 /n *Maith.,* t. XII, n. 6.
io *Dial. c. Tryph.,* 41.
17 Cfr. *Catechismus Romanus, Dr Eucharistia,* qu. 14.

■*Cfr. Pohle-Preuss. *Christology,* 2nd ed.. p. 237, St. Louio 1916.

-°*ir ἀζὔμοα.*
81 i Cor. V. 8.

wine. "Wine" *(vinum·,* oliw), without any qualifying addition, has always meant, as it means today, wine of the grape *(vinum de vite).* Hence are excluded as invalid the juices extracted and prepared from other fruits (cider, perry, etc.), as well as all the so-called artificial wines, even if their chemical constitution should happen to be identical with the genuine juice of the grape. Origin and color are, however, indifferent, though some hold that our Lord Himself employed red wine. The necessity of wine of grapes for the validity of the Holy Eucharist has never been authoritatively defined by the Church, but it is presupposed by her, *e. g.,* in the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council,[22] the Council of Florence, [23] and the Council of Trent.[24]

a) Though the words of institution contain no direct reference to wine, but merely speak of the "chalice" *(calix, ποτηρων),* there can be no doubt that the chalice blessed by our Lord at the Last Supper contained genuine wine.

This can be deduced partly from the rite of the Passover, which required the head of the family to pass around the "cup of benediction" *(calix benedictionis')* containing wine of grapes, and partly from Christ's own express declaration, Matth. XXVI, 29: "I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine *(genimine*

22 A. D. 1215. *Caput "Firmiter"* (Denzingcr-Banowart, n. 43°)·

23 *V.* No. i, *supra.*

2« Ses». XIII, cap. 4 (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 877).

vitis), until that day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father."

There is no need of elaborating the argument from Tradition, as the Catholic Church has always been at one in this matter with the Greeks. We need but peruse the utterances of the Fathers on the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, as cited in the first part of this treatise,[25] to be convinced that both in the East and in the West wine of grapes was always considered necessary for the validity of the Blessed Sacrament. The Hydroparastatae or Aquarians, who used water instead of wine, were regarded as heretics. Harnack's contention [*] that the ancient Church was indifferent as to the use of wine, and more concerned with the action of eating and drinking than with the elements, is absolutely unfounded.[27]

b) An ancient ecclesiastical law[28] prescribes that a little water should be added to the wine before the Consecration. As the rubrics of the Mass forbid the addition of water *after* the Consecration, this obviously has nothing to do with the validity of the Sacrament. The rigor with which this law is enforced is attributed by the Tridentine Council[20] to three motives: (1) because Christ Himself probably added some water to the wine in celebrating the Last Supper; (2) because blood and water flowed from His side on the Cross; and (3) because the mingling of water with wine fittingly symbolizes the intimate union of the faithful with Christ.

The ceremony of adding water to the wine before the

25 *V. supra,* pp. 55 sqq.

20 *Texte und Untersuchungen,* new series. VII, 2 (1891), 115 sqq.

27 Cfr. Funk, *Die Abendmahlselemente bei Tustin,* Paderborn 1897; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchhchen Lilcratur,* Vol. I. pp. 238, Freiburg 1902; Λ. Scheiwiler, *Die Elemente der Eucharistie* in *den ersten drei Jahrhunderten,* Mayence 1903.

28 Cfr. *Decretum pro eirmenis·' "Ante consecrationem aqua modicissima admisceri debet."* (Denringer-Bannwart. n. 698).

2» Sess. XXII, cap. 7.

Consecration derives its dogmatic interest solely from the fact that the Council of Trent enjoins the practice under pain of anathema.[80] This decision may be traced to an ancient custom, common alike among Greeks, Romans, and Jews, of mixing water with the strong southern wines,[81]—which custom was most probably retained by our Divine Saviour at the Last Supper, since the paschal rite expressly prescribed that the wine should be mixed with one-third water. This also explains the fact that the ancient Fathers, notably St. Justin Martyr,[82]* St. Irenaeus,[88] and St. Cyprian,[84] speak of the "*calix mixtus*" (*ποτηριον κ(κραμίνον),* and that the third provincial Council of Carthage ordained that "in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord nothing more be offered than what the Lord Himself handed down, *i. e.* bread and wine mixed with water."[85] The Council in Trullo, of 692, went so far as to depose certain Armenian bishops and priests who, following the example of the Monophysites, employed wine without water at the Consecration.

c) The question has been asked: What becomes of the water added to the wine after the Consecration? This question, once debated with much ardor, is purely theoretical. St. Thomas mentions three different opinions that were held in his day on the subject.[80] The first is, that "the water remains by itself when the wine

80 Sess. XII, can. 9: "St *quis dixerit, aquam* non *miscendam esse vino in calice offerendo, eo quod «it contra Christi institutionem, anathema sit."* (Dcnzinger-Bannwart, n. 9S6).

81 Cfr. Prov. IX. 12: *"Bibite vinum quod miscui vobis."*

•t*Apol.,* I, c. 6$.

88 *Adv. Haer.,* V, 2, 3.

8< *Ep. 63 ad Caecil.,* n. 13 eq. (cd. Hartel, II, 710).

as Can. 22: *". . . ut in sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini nil amplius offeratur quam ipse Dominus tradidit, h. c. panis et vinum aquâ mixtum."*

88 Summa Theol., 3a, qu. 74, art.

is changed into blood." The second, that "as the wine is changed into blood, so the water is changed into the water which flowed from Christ's side." The third, that "the water is changed into wine, and the wine into blood." The last-mentioned opinion, which the /Xngelic Doctor considers "the more probable," was favored by Pope Innocent III (1198-1216)." It is no longer tenable in so far as it assumes that the water is chemically changed into wine,[38] since modern physics teaches that the phenomena of osmose and diffusion are not a chemical but a physical process.[39] But there is no objection to the theory propounded by Cardinal De Lugo[40] that the mixture of wine and water in the chalice is immediately transformed into the Precious Blood of Christ. This theory is quite plausible in view of the fact that pure wine contains no less than ninety per cent, of water.[41]

37 L. III Decret., tit. 41, c. 6: *"Verum inter opiniones praedictas illa probabilior indicatur, quae asserit aquam cum vino in sanguinem transmutari."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 4*6)·

83 Cfr. Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* dissert. 3, art. 4.

3» Cfr. L. Dresse), S. J., *Lehrbuck der Physik,* Vol. I, 3rd ed.. pp. 149 sqq., 413 sqq.. Freiburg 1905.

so *De Eucharistia, disp.* 4, sect. 3-4-

41 On the congruity of the two Eucharistic elements cfr. Oswald, *Die hl. Sakramente der hath. Kirche,*

SECTION *2*

THE SACRAMENTAL FORM, OR THE WORDS OF CONSECRATION

There is no reason to assume that Christ at the Last Supper consecrated by an act of His will without the use of words. But even if this could be proved, it would not alter the fact that His human ministers convert bread and wine into His Flesh and Blood by pronouncing the words of institution: "This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood." This fact settles the question as to the sacramental form of the Holy Eucharist.

There remains, however, another question of considerable importance, *viz.:* whether the priest consecrates solely by virtue of the words of institution, or also by means of the so-called Epiklesis, which occurs in the Oriental liturgies shortly after the words of institution and expresses a petition to the Holy Spirit, "that the bread and wine may be converted into the Body and Blood of Christ."

Thesis I: Christ did not consecrate by a mere inarticulate act of His omnipotent will, but by pronouncing the words, "This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood."

This proposition may be qualified as *sententia certa.*

Proof. The question at issue is not: Could

Christ, had He so willed, have consecrated by a mere "blessing," [1] without the use of words? but: Did He actually consecrate by pronouncing the words of institution?

The Council of Trent defines: . after [not *by* or *through]* the blessing of the bread and wine, He testified in express and clear words that He gave them His own very Body and His own Blood; words which, recorded by the holy Evangelists, and afterwards repeated by St. Paul. . . ."[2] Though the Council in this declaration does not clearly enunciate the proposition contained in our thesis, yet it is perfectly clear that the Fathers of Trent believed that Christ consecrated by pronouncing the words of institution.

a) We know from the Gospel that, in instituting the Blessed Sacrament, our Divine Lord employed the words, "This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood." In adding the command, "Do this for a commemoration of me," He plainly wished to say: Do as you have seen and heard me do. Consequently, He Himself consecrated by pronouncing the words, "This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood."

If the words of institution were purely a declaration that the conversion had taken place in the benediction, unannounced and unexpressed, the Apostles and their succes-

1 *Benedixit, ιὐλογήσα!·*

2 Sess. XIII. cap. i: *"Post panis unique benedictionem se suum ipsius corpus illis praebere ac suum sanguinem disertis ac perspicuis verbis testatus est, quae verba a sanctis Evangelistis commemorata et a Jiva Paulo repetita. . .* (Denxingcr-Bannwart, n. 874).

sors would, according to Christ's example and mandate, have been obliged to consecrate in this mute manner also, a consequence which is inadmissible (v. Thesis II).

b) Whatever may be thought of the cogency of the above interpretation, there can be no doubt that it was defended by some of the early Fathers and ecclesiastical writers. Thus Tertullian says: "Christ converted the bread which He had taken and distributed to His disciples, into His own Body by saying: 'This is my Body.'"[3] Similarly the pseudo-Ambrose, whose writings are probably a transcript of sermons delivered by St. Ambrose in the Cathedral of Milan. "The speech of Christ," he says, "effected this Sacrament."[4] St. Chrysostom writes: "As the words which God [Christ] pronounced are the same as those which the priest utters to-day, so, too, the sacrifice is exactly the same."[5]

The Scholastic view of the matter is expressed thus by Suarez: "Christ consecrated by pronouncing the words just quoted, as they are reported by the Evangelists. This in my opinion is so certain that it would be temerarious to defend the contrary; it is the common opinion of theologians, including St. Thomas and Peter Lombard."[6]

Pope Innocent III, before his elevation to the pontifi-

3 *Contra. Marcionem,* IV, 40: *"Acceptum panem* et *distributum discipulis [Christus] corpus* suum fecit '*hoc est corpus* meum' di·

‹ *De Sacram.,* IV, 4 (Migne, *P. L.,* XVI, 440): *"Quomodo potest qui panis est, corpus esse Christi? Consecratione. Consecratione autem guibus Verbis est, cuius termonibus? Domini lesu. . . . Ubi venitur,* ut *conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, iam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit sacramentum."*

6 *Hom. in* 2 *Tim.,* 2 sub *finem.* Other Patristic texts under Thesis II, *infra.*

0 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 58, sect. 1, n. 4: *"Dicendum est Christum consecrasse praedictis verbis semel prolatis, prout ab Bvangelistis referuntur. Haec ita certa est meo iu-*

cate, held the opinion which Suarez, in common with most later theologians, branded as " temerarious," *viz.:* that Christ consecrated without words by means of a mere " benediction." [7] Not many theologians, however, followed him in this view, among the few being Ambrosius Catharinus,[8] Cheffontaines," and L. A. Hoppe.[10] By far the greater number preferred to stand by the testimony of the Fathers. Restricted to the Divine Author of the Blessed Sacrament the view of Innocent III[11] can at most be said to be temerarious. Ambrosius Catharinus and ChefFontaines went farther. They maintained that in the Mass the Consecration is not effected by the words of institution, which are merely declaratory, but through the instrumentality of other prayers. This view, though a logical deduction from the one previously quoted, is untenable, as we shall show in our next thesis.

Thesis II: By the articulate utterance, on the part of the priest, of the words of institution: " This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood," Christ becomes immediately present on the altar.

This proposition is *fidci proxima.*

Proof. Passing for the present over the ques-

dicio, ni contraria non potsil absque temeritate defendi; est communis theologorum cum D. Thoma (S. *Theo!.,* ja, qu. 78, art. 1) *et Magistro."*

7 *De S. Altaris Myst.,* IV, 6: " S'eue *dici potest quod Christus divirtute confecit et postea formam expressit, sub quo posteri benedicerent; ipse namque per se ex illa virtute, quam indidit ver-*

s *Quibus Verbis Christus Eucharistiae Sacramentum Confecerit,* *55».

0 *Varii Tract.,* I, t Sqq., 1586.

*o *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgie,* Schaffhausen r86q.

11 This view was also defended by Huguccio (d. mo). Praepoaitinus (about rroo), Odo of Cambray (d. m3), Stephen of Autun (d. «IJ9) *el al.*

tion whether or not the words of institution constitute the sole form of the Sacrament,[12]* we have here merely to prove that the words "This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood," are truly words of Consecration, and therefore belong to the sacramental form of the Eucharist.

The dogmatic teaching of the Church on this head may be deduced from the following declaration of the Council of Trent: "This faith has ever been in the Church of God, that immediately after the Consecration the veritable Body of our Lord and His veritable Blood, together with His soul and Divinity, are under the species of bread and wine; but the Body indeed under the species of bread, and the Blood under the species of wine, by the force of the words."[13] The phrase "by the force of the words" *(ex vi verborum)* plainly points to a twofold group of words,— the one referring to "the Body under the species of bread," the other, to "the Blood under the species of wine." Both groups are embodied in the words of institution: "This is my Body, . . . this is my Blood." Consequently, it is the teaching of the Tridentine Council that the words of institution constitute the form of Consecration and that they are at least the partial form of the Sacrament.

The schismatic Greek Church refuses to accept this teaching. It holds that the priest does not consecrate by virtue of the words of institution, but by means of the

12 V. Thesis III, *infra.*

13 Sess. XIII, cap. 3: *"Semper haec Udes in Ecclesia Dei fuit, statim consecrationem verum corpus verumque eius sanguinem sub panis et vini specie «na* cum *ipsius anima et divinitate existere; sed corpus quidem sub specie panis et sanguinem sub vini specie ex vi verborum."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 876).

Epiklesis. In taking this attitude the Greeks not only contradict the Council of Trent, but likewise the dogmatic *Decretum pro Armenis* of Eugene IV, promulgated at the Council of Florence, which says: "The form of this Sacrament are the words of the Saviour, by means of which He effects this Sacrament; for the priest, speaking in the person of Christ, effects this Sacrament." [14] This was the common doctrine of both Churches until Peter Mogilas in his famous *"Confessio Fidei Orthodoxa"* (A. D. 1642),[15][16] declared that the words of institution possess no intrinsic consecratory force. Mogilas was followed, in 1672, by the Council of Jerusalem and, ultimately, by the entire schismatic Church.

The late Dr. H. Schell tried to reconcile the teaching of the schismatic Greeks with that of the Latin Church by arguing that the priest who says Mass according to the Roman rite consecrates by virtue of the words of institution, while the priest who offers up the Holy Sacrifice according to the Greek rite consecrates by virtue of the F.piklesis, except among the Uniates, where the intention of consecrating by virtue of the words of Christ is prescribed.[10] However, this view is untenable.

a) For the argument from Holy Scripture we refer the reader to Thesis I, *supra.*

The teaching of Tradition may be gathered from the writings of the Fathers and the practice

14 Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 698: *" Forma huius sacramenti sunt verba Salvatoris, quibus hoc conticii sacramentum; sacerdos enim in persona Christi loguens hoc conficit sacramentum."*

16 Qu. 107. *Cfr.* Kimmel. *Monum. Fidei Eccles. Orient.,* I, p. 180, Jena 1850; Michalcescu. *Die Bekenntnisse und wichtigsten Glaubensseugnisse der griechisch-orient. Kirche,* p. 73, Leipzig 1904.

10 Schell, *Kath. Dogmalih,* Vol. III. a, pp. 539 sqq.

of the Church. As we are arguing against the Greek schismatics, we shall confine ourselves to the Greek Fathers and liturgies.

a) The Greeks can be shown the error of their present teaching from their own writings. They themselves formerly placed the form of the Blessed Sacrament in the words of institution. St. Justin Martyr (A. D. 150) says: "We take this, not as common bread and common drink, but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made flesh through the Divine Logos [in the sense of 'Ovcrshadower of the virgin'] had flesh and blood for the sake of our redemption, thus we have been instructed that the meat blessed by the word of prayer coming from Him (διὶ ἰΰχτ) λόγου τοΰ *παρ'* αὐτοϋ), by which our flesh and blood are nourished through conversion, is the Flesh and Blood of that same Incarnate Jesus. For the Apostles have handed it down in their memoirs, which are called Gospels, that they were instructed as follows: That Christ took bread, gave thanks, and said: 'Do this for a commemoration of me, this is my Body'; and that in a similar manner He took the cup, gave thanks, and said: 'This is my Blood,' giving them all to partake thereof." [17]

St. Irenæus of Lyons (born about 140) speaks of an "invocation of God" over the bread,[18] but he identifies this "Epiklesis" with the "word of God," saying that "the chalice and the bread receive the word of God." [10] The only "word of God" occurring in the Gospel in connection with the institution of the Eucharist is that

ilApol.. I, 66 (Migne, *P. C.*, VI, 426).

18 *Adv. Hacr.*, IV. 18, 5: τήμ {■κIκΚησιν τον Οεοΰ.

" *Of. cil.*, V. *2.* 3: ἰπ<«χ£ται τον λόγον τοὐ Οτοΰ.

pronounced by Christ, whereas the Epiklesis of the Greek Church is a purely ecclesiastical institution.

St. Gregory of Nyssa teaches: "This bread, as the Apostle says, is sanctified by the word of God and the prayer, converting itself into the Body of the Logos not by eating and drinking, but passing in one moment into the Body of the Logos, as it was spoken by the Logos Himself: 'This is my Body.'"[20]

A weighty witness is St. Chrysostom, in whose liturgy the Epiklesis plays an important rôle. He says: "It is no [mere] man who causes the [bread and wine] to be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, who was crucified for us. Taking the part of Christ, the priest stands there, pronouncing those words; but it is the power and grace of God. 'This is my Body,' he declares. This word converts that which lies before him (τοὐτο το *ρήμα μεταρρυθμίζει* τα *προκάμένα*). And as the command, 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth' was uttered but once, communicating permanent fertility to the human race, so, too, this word [of Christ], spoken but once, causes the perfect victim [to be present] upon all the altars of the churches from thenceforth to the present, and until the last day."[21]

St. John Damascene writes: "As God by the exclamation 'Let there be light!' created the light, so He effects this mystery by the words, 'This is my Body.'"[22]

β) The Greek Cardinal Bessarion,[23] at the Council of Florence (i439)> called the attention of his fellow-countrymen to the fact that in the ancient liturgies of SS.

20 Or. *Colech.,* c. 37 (Migne, *P. G.,* XLV, 94).

21 *Hom. de Prod. ludac,* I, n. 6 (Migne. *P. G.,* LIX, 380).

22 *De Fide Orth.,* IV, 13 (Migne, *P. G.,* XCIV, 1147). These Patristic texts are differently explained by Rauschen, *Eucharijt and Penance in the Firrl Sir Centurier of the Church,* pp. tij sqq., St. Louis 1913-

23 *Bibl. Pair.*. Vol. XXVI, p. *79$.*

Basil and Chrysostom supreme adoration and homage are given to the Holy Eucharist as soon as the words of institution have been pronounced, whence it follows that the Consecration is effected by those words. By way of example we will cite the Ethiopian liturgy.

Celebrant (with outstretched hands): "And in that night in which He was betrayed, He took the bread, . . . gave it to His disciples, saying: 'Eat ye all thereof, this bread is my Body, which was broken for you unto the forgiveness of sins. Amen."

The People (thrice): "Amen. We believe and are sure of it We praise Thee, O Lord, our God, this is truly, we believe it, Thy Body."

Celebrant: "In a similar manner He took the chalice. . . and said to them: 'Take and drink ye all of it, this is the chalice of my Blood, which is shed for you unto the salvation of many. Amen."

The People: "Amen. It is truly Thy Blood, we believe."[2*]

Then follows the famous Epiklesis, which runs as follows:

"We beseech Thee, O Lord, and we pray, that Thou send down the Holy Spirit and His power upon this bread and this chalice, and convert them into the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, from eternity to eternity. Amen."

b) It remains to discuss the intention of the consecrating priest and to determine exactly in what words the form of Consecration consists.

a) How can the mere recitation of the words of institution, taken from the narrative of the Last Supper, possess consecratory force? If the celebrant of the Mass were to say: "Let this be my Body," the intention to consecrate would be clearly enunciated. It is for this reason that the Greeks insist on the use of a deprecative

HApud Rcnaudot. *Lit. Orient.,* Vol. I, p. Si7.

formula, like the one contained in the Epiklesis. There can be no question that, in order to convert bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, the priest must have the intention to consecrate. There would be no Consecration if, in repeating the words of institution, he merely intended to relate an historical event. He must pronounce them, therefore, with the practical purpose of effecting the conversion ; nor is it indifferent which words he employs. The effect will depend on his employing those words which Christ has instituted as the sacramental form, and which He Himself employed in consecrating, *i. e.* the words of institution. Hence if the priest, in celebrating Mass, says: "This is my Body," he speaks and acts not in his own name and person, but "in the Person of Christ," as His minister, and as an instrument of the Divine Omnipotence.[25]

Scotus[20] demands for the validity of the Consecration the recitation of the words "*Qui pridie quam pateretur,*" which precede the formula of Consecration in the Canon. He says, if these words were omitted, it would not be apparent whether the priest were speaking in his own name or in that of Christ. We cannot share this view. For, in the first place, the words in question are purely historical and narrative, and, secondly, according to the general principles regarding the intention of the minister (as explained in a previous volume of this series),[22] the validity of the entire Eucharistic act in its last analysis depends on the internal intention of the priest to consecrate with the words of Christ, which intention might well be present even if the words demanded by Scotus were omitted.[28]

as *Cfr.* Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacramenti.* Vol. I. pp. 146 *<iq.

:e *Comment, in Sent.,* IV, dist. 8, qu. 8.

ar Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacramenti.* Vol. I. pp. i7J ,,M.

2» Cfr. St. Thomas. *Theol.*. ja. qu. 78. art. 1, »<l 4.

What if a schismatic priest would say Mass with the express intention of consecrating not by the divine words of institution, but by the Epiklcsis? If this were generally the case among the schismatic Greeks, should we not be forced to the conclusion that, since the seventeenth century at least, when the Greek Church began officially to connect the Consecration with the Epiklesis, they no longer say Mass validly?

If the minister of a Sacrament performs the prescribed rite conscientiously and with the proper intention, the Sacrament is validly administered and will produce its effects regardless of any erroneous notions the minister may harbor concerning the essential or non-essential character of this or that part of the form. It may happen among us that a learned and faithful priest is in doubt as to what is essential in the matter or form of a Sacrament. Nevertheless, he administers the Sacrament validly if he has the proper intention and conscientiously performs the prescribed rite from beginning to end. Though the Greeks may in the best of faith go on erroneously maintaining that they consecrate exclusively by the Epiklesis, nevertheless, as in the case of the Latins, they actually consecrate by means of the words of institution contained in their liturgies, provided, of course, that they really intend to celebrate Mass, of which as a rule there can be no reasonable doubt. Only in the imaginary supposition that a schismatic priest were so filled with hatred against Rome that he would rather not consecrate at all than consecrate by means of the words of institution, should we be justified in concluding that there was a lack of genuine intention and that, consequently, the Mass was invalid.®0

20 On the effect of contrary intentions see De Lugo, *De Sacra·*

β) Which particular words are essential in the iorm of Consecration? All theologians agree that *"Hoc est corpus meum,— hic est sanguis meus"* are undoubtedly essential. The majority further hold that these words are sufficient to insure the validity of the double Consecration, though to omit the other words prescribed by the Church, especially in the consecration of the chalice, would be a grievous sin. The principle on which this opinion is based may be stated as follows: That, and that only, belongs to the essence of the sacramental form, which precisely designates the effect of the Sacrament. Now, the words, " This is my Body, this is my Blood," effect the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine. Therefore, these words effect the presence and constitute the essence of the sacramental form of the Eucharist.

With regard to the consecration of the bread this is quite clear, as the Roman Canon of the Mass, unlike the Greek, employs no other words besides " This is my Body." The case is somewhat different with regard to the consecration of the wine. St. Thomas says: " Some have maintained that the words ' This is the chalice of my Blood ' alone belong to the substance of the form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's Blood ; consequently they belong to the integrity of the expression. And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form, down to the words, ' As often as ye shall do this.' . . [80] Some of the later Thomists at-

80 *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 78, art. 3: *" Quidam dixerunt quod de substantia formae huius est hoc solum quod dicitur: ' Hic est calix santuinû met," non autem ea quae sequuntur. Sed hoc t-idrtur Ineo»·*

tempt to reconcile their master's opinion with the common teaching, by drawing a distinction between *essentia formae* and *substantia formae,* and referring the above-quoted passage only to the "substance," *i. e.* the integrity of the form, not to its "essence."[31] The older Thomists took *substantia formae* and *essentia formae* as synonymous terms and held that without the words insisted on by Aquinas there is probably no conversion of the wine. This latter view is utterly untenable, first, because of the parity existing between the consecration of the bread and that of the wine, the first sentence, *"Hoc est corpus meum,"* being absolutely parallel to the second, *"Hic est sanguis meus,"* and, secondly, for the reason that the words on which St. Thomas insists do not occur in the Greek liturgy.[32]

Thesis III: The words of institution contain the only and wholly adequate form of the Eucharist, and consequently the Epiklesis possesses no consecratory value, nay it does not even constitute the partial form of the Sacrament.

This thesis may be technically qualified as *sententia certa.*

Proof. In the foregoing thesis we showed that the words of institution belong to the sacramental form of the Eucharist. It remains to

.veniens, quia *ca quae sequuntur sunt quaedam determinationes praedicati,* i. *e. sanguinis Christi; unde pertinent ad integritatem eiusdem locutionis. Et propter hoc sunt alii, qui melius dicunt quod omnia sequentia sunt de substantia formae usque ad hoc quod postea sequitur: 'Haec*

31 Thus Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* diss. S, art. 3, § 2.

32 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 6o, sect 1; Billuart's interpretation has found a modern defender in De Augustinis, *De Re Sacrament.,* Vol. I, 2nd ed., pp- 655 sqq-

prove that they constitute the only and wholly adequate form, and that the Epiklesis is therefore not essential.

The contention that the words of the Epiklesis have a joint essential value and constitute a part of the form of the Eucharist, was first made by Archbishop Kabasilas of Thessalonica (about 1354). It was repeated by the bitterly anti-Roman controversialist Marcus Eugenicus of Ephesus (d. about 1447), by Samonas of Gaza, and other Greek writers. A few Latin theologians, notably Touttée,[83] Renaudot,[84] and Lebrun[85] adopted this view. It cannot be condemned as heretical, since it allows to the words of institution their essential, though only a partial consecratory value; but it is intrinsically repugnant. The act of Consecration cannot remain, as it were, in a state of suspense, but is completed in an instant of time, and hence there arises the dilemma: Either the words of institution alone, and, therefore, not the Epiklesis, are productive of the conversion, or the words of the Epiklesis alone have such power, and not the words of institution. At the Council of Florence (1439) the Catholic Church made it plain that the words of institution alone constitute the sacramental form of the Eucharist. In 1822, Pope Pius VII declared in a letter to the Antiochene Patriarch of the Melchites, that "in virtue of obedience" no one was permitted to defend the schismatic teaching on this subject, either publicly or in private.[80]

33 A. Touttée, O. S. B., *Opera S. Cyrilli Hierotol., Praef.,* diss. 3, ch.

34 *Lit. Orient.,* Vol. I. pp. 96 sqq.. 238 sqq., Paris 1716.

33 *Explication de la Mette,* diss. 10, art 17, Paris 1726·

38 ". . . *formam, qua tfitificum tacranienlum perficitur, non in toile letu Christi verbis contieiere.*" (Laemmcr, *Decreta Cone. Ruthrnor. Zamoeciensis,* p. 56. Freiburg ■86$).

a) We have already adverted to the fact that the whole question came up for discussion in the Council of Florence, where the Greeks were invited to explain their position on the Epiklesis. Eugene IV urged them to come to an agreement with the Roman faith and to drop the contention that the Epiklesis possesses consecratory force. The Council originally intended to define it as of faith that the Consecration is effected solely by the words of Christ: "This is my Body, this is my Blood." But when the Greeks pleaded that they had always believed in the consecratory power of the words of institution, and that a dogmatic decision would reflect upon their whole ecclesiastical past,[87] the Council desisted from its purpose and declared itself satisfied with the oral declaration of Cardinal Bessarion,[88] that the Greeks follow the universal teaching of the Fathers, especially of "Blessed John Chrysostom, familiarly known to us," according to whom "the divine words of our Redeemer contain the full power of Transubstantiation."[89]

In view of these facts it will not do to attribute the efforts made by Eugene IV and the Council of Florence to a desire "to bring the Greek rite into as close a conformity as possible to the Latin rite without detriment to the dogmatic possibility of consecrating by means of the Epiklesis."[90] The Council of Florence, which in the question of unleavened bread and other matters had

8" Cfr. Hardouin, *Collect. Concil.,* Vol. IX, p. 981.

88 This declaration is recorded in the minutes of the Council for July 5, >439-

80 " *Quoniam ab omnibus sanctis doctoribus Ecclesiae, prasertim ab illo B. loanne Chrysostomo,* qui *nobis notissimus est, audimus verba Dominica esse ilia quae mulanl et transsubstanliant panem et* vinum tn *corpus verum Christi et sanguinem, et quod illa verba divina Salvatoris omnem virtutem transsubstantiationis habent, nos ipsum sanctissimum doctorem et illius sententiam sequimur de necessitate,"* (Migne, *P-* C,, CLXI, 49O. On the teaching of St. Chrysostom v. *supra,* p. ao$.

<0 H. Schell, *Kath. Dogmatill,* Vol. HI, ı, p. S4i,.

shown itself so considerate in meeting the demands of the Greek Church, based its decision in regard to the Epiklesis on the firm conviction that the words of institution alone effect the Consecration, and consequently constitute the sole form of the Eucharist.*[41]

b) The dogmatic aspects of the Epiklesis, its peculiar position in the Oriental rite, and its venerable antiquity, have given rise to a vast literature, which has not, however, led to a definitive conclusion.

The Epiklesis would offer no theological difficulties if it preceded instead of following the words of institution in the Canon of the Mass. In that case, like the analogous invocation of the Roman Missal, it would clearly be nothing but the expression, in the form of a prayer, of the priest's intention of converting the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. In matter of fact, however, the Epiklesis in all the Oriental liturgies,— with the exception of the Syriac liturgy of Addai and Mari, which entirely omits it,— invariably *follows* the words of institution.*[42] This gives rise to the question how the Epiklesis may be made to harmonize with the words of Christ, which alone possess consecratory power. Two explanations have been suggested.

a) The first considers the Epiklesis to be a mere declaration of the fact that the conversion has taken place, or that in the conversion an essential part is to be

41 On the attitude of the Armenians see Hcfele, *Conciliengeachichtc.* Vol. II, and ed., p. 656 sqq., Freiburg 1890. On the whole subject-matter of this section, cfr. Franzelin. *Dr SS. E-charittia.* then

42 Of the occidental liturgies only the so-called Mozarabic has the Epiklesis following the words of institution.

attributed to the Holy Spirit as co-Consecrator, just as in the mystery of the Incarnation.[43] According to this theory the Epiklesis possesses only a declarative value, dramatically recalling an historic event to the imagination, but nevertheless refers to the Consecration as such.[44] The priest, at the moment of the Consecration, cannot actually express all the thoughts that move the heart of the Church. Therefore, lest the important part of the Holy Ghost in the act of the Consecration be passed over in silence, he goes back in imagination to the precious moment and speaks and acts as if the Consecration were just about to occur. Thus in the Epiklesis liturgical art conspires with psychology to draw out, as it were, the brief but pregnant moment of the Consecration into a series of vivid dramatic acts. The Epiklesis, therefore, bears the same relation to the Consecration as the periphery of a circle to its centre.[45] A similar purely retrospective transfer is met with in other portions of the liturgy, as in the Mass for the dead, when the Church prays for the departed as if they were still capable of being rescued from the gates of hell.[40]

/3) A second explanation refers the Epiklesis, not to the enacted Consecration, but to the approaching Communion, inasmuch as the latter, being the means of uniting us more closely in the organized body of the Church, makes us members of the mystical Christ. The invoca-

43 On the analogy between the Eucharist and the Incarnation see Lessius, *De Perfect, iloribusquc Divinis,* XI, i6, 129.

44 This is denied by Bellarmine, Suarez, De Lugo, Simar, and oth- *"Oportet haec aliaque huiiismodi non tamquam in tempore, in quo dicuntur, sed tamquam in tempore, pro quo dicuntur, ita intelligere, ac si tempus illud maneret minimeque defluereт."*

45 Cfr. Card. Bessarion's declaration (Migne, *P. G.,* CLXI, 5i7): <e Cfr. Gutberlet, in Heinrich-Gutbcrlet's *Dogmatische Théologie,* Vol. IX, p. 73>.

tion of the Holy Spirit has for its object, not to produce the sacramental Christ by Transubstantiation, but by.a sort of spiritual transformation wrought in holy Communion, to fructify the Body and Blood of Christ for the benefit of priest and people, as we read in the Roman Canon of the Mass: *" Ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri lesii Christi." ,T* It was in this purely mystical manner that the Greeks themselves explained the meaning of the Epiklesis at the Council of Florence.[48]

Since, however, much more is contained in the plain words of the Epiklesis than this mysticism, it is desirable to combine both explanations into one.

Critical Appreciation of the Two Theories.— Both liturgically and in point of time the Epiklesis stands as a significant connecting link between the Consecration and Communion. In its relation to the Consecration, it is an attempt to bring time to a standstill, as it were, to fix the precious moment in the imagination, and to emphasize the part taken by the Holy Spirit as co-Consecrator. In its relation to Communion, it is a petition to the Holy Ghost to obtain the realization of the true presence of the Body and Blood of Christ by their fruitful effects in the souls of priest and people. Here we have the mystical, there the real Christ;— these are the two underlying ideas of the Epiklesis,

eages in ancient liturgies see Heinrich-Gutbcriet, *op. cit.,* pp. 729 sqq.

<8 Asked for their opinion, they declared in the twenty-fifth session: *" Fateri not dirimus, per haec verba [scil. hoc est corpus meum] transsubslantiari sacrum panem el fieri corpus Christi; sed postea, quemadmodum et ipsi* [Latini] *dicitis: I lube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum '* (this prayer, however, is hardly an Epiklesis), *ita nos quoque oramus dicentes: ' ut Spiritus S. descendat super nos et efficiat in nobis panem hunc pretiosum corpus Christi tui, et quod in calice isto est, pretiosum sanguinem Christi tui transmutetque ipsa Spiritu S. suo, ut fiant communicantibus in purgationem animae," etc.*

which may therefore be defined as "the ritual development of the content of the Holy Eucharist, both in respect of faith and grace, with particular reference to the Holy Spirit, for the purpose of glorifying Him as co-Consecrator and Dispenser of all graces, and for the spiritual benefit of priest and people." 40

Readings: — The general treatises mentioned *supra,* pp. 7 sq.— W. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der kath. Liturgik,* 2nd revised and enlarged edition by L. Eisenhofcr, 2 vols., Freiburg 1912.— Hilarius a Sexten, O. Cap., *Tractatus Pastoralis de Sacramentis,* Mayence 1895.—*P. Gasparri, *Tractatus Canonicus de SS. Eucharistia,* Paris 1897.— J. E. Pruner, *Lehrbuch der Pastoralthcologie,* Vol. I, 2nd ed., Paderborn 1904.— G. Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* St. Louis 1913.— A. Devine, C. P., *The Sacraments Explained,* PP. I/S sqq., 3rd cd., London 1905.

Giese, *Erorterung der Strcitfrage Uber den Gebrauch der Azymen,* Munster 1852.— Funk, *"Die Abcndmahlslehre bei Justin,"* in *Kirchcngeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen,* Vol. I, pp. 278 sqq., Paderborn 1897.—*A. Seheiwiler, *Die Elenicnte der Eucharistie in den ersten drci Jahrhunderten,* Mayence 1903.

I. A. Orsi, *Dissertatio de Invocatione S. Spiritus in Liturgiis Graecis et Orientalibus,* Milan 1731.— C. Henke, *Die kath. Lehre iibcr die Konsckrationsworte,* Treves 1850.—*Hoppe *Die Epiklesis der griechischcn und oricntalischen Liturgie,* Schaffhausen 1864. — J. Th. Franz, *Der eucharistische Konsekrationsmoment,* Würzburg 1875.— Idem, *Die eucharistische IPandlung and die Epiklese*

4» Scheeben-Atzberger, *Handbuch der kath. Dogmalik,* Vol. IV, 2, p. 6>9, Freiburg 1901.— See also Schceben, *"Studien iibcr den Messkanon,"* in the *Katholik,* of Mayence, 1866, 2, pp. 526 sqq., 679 sqq.; Idem, *Die Mysterien des Christentums,* 3rd cd., pp. 449 sqq., Freiburg 1912; E. Lingens, S. J., *"Die eucharistische Konsckrationsformel,"* in the Innsbruck *Zeitschrift filr kath. Théologie,* 1896, PP. 745 sqq.; 1897, pp. 61 sqq.; G. Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* pp. 115 sqq., St. Louis >913; G. Scmeria, *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Roman Rite, its History and Symbolism,* tr. by Berry, pp. 157 sqq.. New York 19H.

iler griechischen und orientalischen Liturgien, Würzburg r88o. — Watterich, *Der Konsekrationsmoment im hl. Abendmahlc.* Heidelberg 1896.— A. Fortescue, art. "Epiklesis" in Vol. V of the *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

A. M. Lepicier, *Tractatus de SS. Eucharistia. Pars I: De Eucharistia ut est Sacramentum,* Paris 1916.

CHAPTER II

SACRAMENTAL EFFECTS

The only solemn definition regarding the sacramental effects of the Holy Eucharist is Canon 5, Session XIII, of the Tridentine Council, directed against Luther and Calvin. It runs as follows: "If anyone saith that the principal fruit of the most Holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result therefrom, let him be anathema." [1]

This definition leaves no doubt that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrament of the living; but it does not tell us precisely what are its effects. These are, however, briefly indicated in Sess. XIII, cap. 2, of the same Council,[2] and in Eugene IV's famous *Decretum pro Armenis*.[3] A careful consideration of these indications enables us to group the effects of the Holy Eucharist around two central ideas, *viz.:* (1) Union with Christ by love, and (2) the spiritual nourishment of the soul.

As a means of uniting the soul with Christ,

1 Sees. XIII, can. 5: *"Si quit dixerit, vel praecipuum fructum SS. Eucharistiae esse remissionem pcc- provenire, anathenra sit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 887).

2 Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 875·

3 Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 698.

SACRAMENTAL EFFECTS

Holy Communion both sanctifies and heals. As a food, it produces in the soul effects similar to those produced by material food in the body.

SECTION i

FIRST AND PRINCIPAL EFFECT: UNION OF THE SOUL WITH CHRIST BY LOVE

The first and principal effect of the Holy Eucharist is union of the soul with Christ by love.[1]

As the sacramental union with Christ which results from the bodily consumption of the Sacred Host is an application rather than an effect of the Sacrament, the principal effect must be sought in the spiritual and mystical union of the soul with Jesus through the theological virtue of love, which is kindled, nourished, and consummated by physical contact with the Sacred Body of the Lord, *ex opere operato.* The Holy Eucharist is " the Sacrament of Love " *par excellence.*

a) Christ Himself describes Holy Communion as a union of love resembling the Trinitarian Perichoresis.[2] Cfr. John VI, 57 sq.: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in Him. ... He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me."

The Fathers speak of this mysterious process as a unification, a marvellous blending of the soul with the

1 " sldunah'o *ad Chriilum."* {Deer, *pro Armenis,* 1439; Denzinger-Banuwart, n. 698).

2 Cfr. Pohlc-Prcuss, *The Divine Trinity,* pp. 281 sqq., and cd.. St. Louis 1915.

essence of the God-man.[5] It consists neither in a natural synthesis analogous to that between soul and body, nor in a hypostatic union of the soul with the person of the Divine Logos, nor finally in a pantheistic deification of the communicant, but simply in a moral union which lies between the beatific vision, of which it is the exemplar and guarantee, and the earthly union effected by sanctifying grace. Being a theandric effect produced by physical contact with the glorified humanity of the Word, this Eucharistic union,— rightly called *communio,*[4]— is far more intimate and profound than that effected invisibly by the Holy Ghost or by the reception of the other Sacraments.[6]

b) This Eucharistic union of the soul with Christ forms the bond of charity existing between the faithful and constitutes them the "mystical Body" of Christ.[7]

St. Paul says: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread."[8] That is to say, as the individual soul becomes one with Christ through Holy Communion, so all who partake of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament are made one. It is in this sense that St. Augustine writes: "Our Lord Christ . . . consecrated the mystery of our peace and union in His table. Whoever receives the mystery of union and does not keep the bond of peace, does not receive the mystery for himself, but a testimony against himself."[9]

5 St. Cyril of Alex., *In loo.,* IV, /Communion, J 4 sqq.. Ratisbon 1884.

4 K *supra,* p. a.

6 For a subtle discussion of this topic sec Suarez, *Dr Eucharistia,* disp. 64, sect. 3; cfr. also Heimbuchcr, *Dir Wirkunscn dcr hl.*

» Cfr. *Cone. Trid.,* Sesa. XIII. cap. 1 and 2.

7 *i* Cor. X. ty.

8 *Strut. 273 ad Infant.: "Dominut Chritlus . . . njiliutn ftfi*

SECTION 2

SECOND effect: increase OF SANCTIFYING GRACE

Since Holy Communion is both a union of the soul with Christ and a spiritual nourishment, it follows: (i) that the Eucharist is not a Sacrament of the living, and consequently does not cause, but presupposes, the state of grace in the recipient; (2) that it merely increases sanctifying grace.

It is as impossible for the soul in the state of mortal sin to receive this heavenly Food with profit, as it would be for a corpse to assimilate natural food and drink. This is an article of faith. As we have seen,0 the Council of Trent, in opposition to Luther and Calvin, expressly defined that the principal fruit of the Holy Eucharist is not the remission of sins. It further says: " [Our Saviour] would also that this Sacrament should be received as the spiritual food of souls, whereby may be fed and strengthened those who live with His life who said: * He that eateth Me, the same shall live by

et unitatis nostrae in rua *mensa consecravit. Qui accipit mysterium unitatis et non tenet vinculum pacis,* non *accipit mysterium pro se, sed testimonium contra se."*— Cfr. on this subject Alb. a Bulsano, *Jnstit. Thcol. Dogmat.,* ed. Gottfried a Graun, Vol. II, pp. 70s sqq., Innsbruck 1894; Ileinrich-Gutberlct, *Dogmat. Théologie,* Vol. IX, PP· 739 sqq·: A. Rademacher, *Die übernalürliche Lebensordnung nach der paulinischen und johanneischcn Théologie,* pp. 230 sqq., Freiburg 1903.

Me.' ''10 We will consider each of these truths separately.

a) That Holy Communion does not establish sanctifying grace in the soul is clear from the fact that St. Paul demands a rigorous self-examination in order to avoid the heinous offence of being guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord by "eating and drinking unworthily." 11

a) It is true that in instituting the Holy Eucharist Christ said of the Chalice: "This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.''12 But in speaking thus, He evidently had in view an effect of the *Sacrifice,* not of the Sacrament; for He did not say that His Blood would be *drunk* unto remission of sins, but *shed* for that purpose.

The Fathers, beginning with St. Justin Martyr,13 never ceased to admonish the faithful that a clear conscience is a necessary requisite of worthy Communion. Thus St. John Chrysostom says: "We must always be on our guard; for no small punishment awaits those who communicate unworthily. Remember how indignant thou art against the betrayer of Jesus and against those who crucified Him. Beware, therefore, lest thou become guilty of His Body and Blood. They killed His most sacred Body, thou receivest Him, in spite of so many benefits, with a guilt-stained soul.''13 St. Augustine insists that no one should approach the Holy Table except he be

lOSess. XIII. cap. 2: *"Sumi autem voluit sacramentum hoc tamquam spiritualem animarum cibum, quo alantur et confortentur viventes vilâ illius, qui dixit: Qui manducat me, et ipse vivet propter me."*

11 I Cor. XI. *37* «iq.
1» Matth. XXVI. 28.
1S *Apol.,* I, n. 66.
14 *Hom, in Mallii., 8s,* n. $.

free from mortal sin. This was the guiding principle of the ancient penitential discipline. St. Cyprian, in his somewhat extravagant zeal for the rigorism of the primitive Church, bitterly deplores the "laxity" by which sinners were permitted in his day to approach the Holy Table without a long and severe penance.[15]

β) Theologians are wont to discuss the question whether the Sacrament of the Eucharist, like Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders, is capable of regaining its effects after it has been sacrilegiously received.[16] We may distinguish two cases, (1) A person who has confessed his sins in good faith, but without the necessary contrition, approaches the Holy Table in the state of mortal sin and, unconscious of the condition of his soul, imagines he receives worthily, whereas in reality he is excused from the crime of sacrilege only by his ignorance. Can such a one regain the fruits of his Communion later by an act of perfect contrition or a valid confession? (2) A person consciously goes to Communion in the state of mortal sin and thus adds a new sin to those he has already committed. Can such a sacrilegious Communion work its effects after the restoration of the soul's proper moral condition has been effected? Suarez,[17] De Lugo,[18] and theologians generally answer both questions in the negative, on the ground that the Eucharist differs in this respect from the Sacraments which imprint a character upon the soul, first, because it

[15] Cfr. St. Augustine, *Tract, in loa.,* 36, n. 11: *"Innocentiam ad altare apportare."*— St. Cyprian, *Ep. 10 ad Presb.: "Nondum poenitentia actâ, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu cius ab episcopo et clero impositi Eucharistia illis datur."*— Cfr. Tepe, *Inst. Theol.,* Vol. IV. PP- 277 sqq·. Paris 1899.

[16] On "reviviscence" see Pohle·Preuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. 156 sqq., 193 sqq.

[17] *De Eucharistia,* disp. 63, sect. 8.

[18] *De Sacramentis in Genera,* disp. 9, sect. 6, n. 107 sqq.

can be received repeatedly, and second, because it is not strictly necessary for salvation. It would, they say, be repugnant to assume that a man who has communicated unworthily throughout life, should be able by a good confession on his deathbed to obtain the fruits of all his sacrilegious Communions.

What if a communicant approaching the Holy Table sacrilegiously were to make an act of perfect contrition before the sacred species became chemically dissolved? According to the probable opinion of many theologians, the Holy Eucharist works its effects successively, not instantaneously, and hence it seems reasonable to assume that in such a case the Sacrament begins to take effect as soon as the *obex gratiae* is removed by perfect contrition.[10]

b) Since the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrament of the living, its effect can consist in nothing else than an increase of sanctifying grace *(justificatio secunda).* This is expressly defined in the *Decretum pro Armenis:* "And because man by grace is incorporated with Christ and united with His members, it follows that grace is augmented in those who receive this Sacrament [of the Eucharist] worthily."[20] The reason is to be sought partly in the Church's teaching regarding the efficacy of her Sacraments in general, and partly in the fact that the Eucharist is essentially

10 On the possibility of the justification *per accidens* of 3 mortal sinner through the Holy Eucharist, see Pohle-Prcuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. 68 sqq.

20 Dcnzingcr-Bannwart, n. 698: *"Et quoniam per gratiam homo Christo incorporatur et membris eius unitur, consequens est quod per hoc sacramentum in sumentibus digne gratia augeatur."*

a banquet which nourishes and sustains the soul by food and drink. Christ Himself assures us: "He that eateth this bread shall live forever."[21]

It is not so easy to discern in what precisely consists the "sacramental grace" of the Eucharist, *i. e.* that particular grace by which this Sacrament differs specifically from the others. We have seen that sanctifying grace and habitual charity are inseparably bound up, if not actually identical,[22] with each other. Now all the Sacraments, when worthily received, augment sanctifying grace and consequently aid man in becoming mystically united with Christ. If the Holy Eucharist accomplishes nothing more than this, how does it differ from the remaining Sacraments? Suarez says that, while the other Sacraments produce certain special effects, for the sake of which they confer special helps and some increase of grace, the Holy Eucharist has for its primary and direct effect to nourish charity solely for its own perfection and a more intimate union with Christ.[23] According to this theory, the special prerogative of the Holy Eucharist lies not merely in its essence and content, *i. e.* Christ Himself, but likewise in its special object and purpose of fanning the flame of actual love to greater ardor. It is this unique effect, which in its last analysis is identical with the union with Christ by love, that we

21 John VI, so.— Cfr. Tertullian's graphic expression: *"Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, «I anima de Deo saginetur." (De Resurrect. Carnis,* 8).

22 F. Pohle-Prcuss, *Grace, Actual and Habitual,* pp. 336 sqq., St. Louis >9'5-

23 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 63. sect. 1, n. 3: *"Reliqua sacramenta vivorum non ordinantur per sc primo ci directe ad nutriendam caritatem propter solam maiorem perfectionem cius maioremque unionem cum Christo, sed ordinantur ad speciales effectus, propter quos conferunt specialia auxilia ei aliquod augmentum gratiae: at vero hoc sacramentum per se primo ordinatur ad perficiendam* unionem *cum Christo."*

recognize as the so-called *gratia sacramentalis of* the Eucharist.21

c) Together with an increase of sanctifying grace the Holy Eucharist produces as its secondary effect a certain spiritual relish or delight of the soul *{delectatio spiritualis).*

Just as food and drink delight and refresh the heart of man, so does this "Heavenly Bread," which "contains within itself all sweetness," refresh and delight the soul of the worthy recipient. This simile has been embodied in the *Decretum pro /Irnieiiis.*30 The delight produced in the soul of the devout communicant must not, however, be confounded with a certain emotional joy or sensible sweetness. Although both may occur as the result of special grace, the true nature of the *delectatio spiritualis* produced by the Holy Eucharist is manifested in a certain cheerful and perhaps even fervent willingness in all that regards Christ and His Church, and in the conscientious fulfilment of the duties of one's state of life. Interior desolation and spiritual dryness are by no means a sign of inadequate preparation, and much less of an unworthy Communion. On the contrary, they are quite often trials by which God tests the souls of those whom He loves.20 If the communicant has fulfilled all the required conditions, he may rest assured that the Sacrament will work its effects in the manner explained by St. Thomas in the Third Part of the *Summa:*

24 *V.* No. i. *supra.*— Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 79. art. *i*; Gihr, *Die hl. Sakramente dcr hath. Kirche,* Vo). I, and cd., pp. 560 sqq.

25 Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 698: *·' Omncmquc effectum, quem materialis cibus et potus quoad vtlam agunt temporalem: sustentando, augendo, reparando et delectando, sacramentum hoc quoad vitam operatur spiritualem."*

2« Cfr. Thonua à Kempis, *Imit. Christi.* IV. ia. 1$.

. through this Sacrament, as far as its power is concerned, not only is the habit of grace and virtue bestowed, but man is furthermore aroused to act, according to *2* Cor. V, 14: 'The charity of Christ presseth us.' Hence it is that the soul is spiritually nourished through the power of this Sacrament, by being spiritually gladdened, and as it were inebriated with the sweetness of the divine goodness."[27]

27 *Summa Thcol.,* 3a, qu. 79, art. 1, ad 2: *"Per hoc sacramentum, quantum erf ex sui virtute, non solum habitus gratiae et virtutis confertur, sed etiam excitatur homo in actum secundum illud (z Cor.* V, 14): *Caritas Christi urget nos. Ei inde est quod ex virtute huius sacramenti anima spiritualiter reficitur per hoc, quod anima spiritualiter delectatur et quodammodo inebriatur dulcedine bonitatis divinae."*— Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 63, sect. 9; De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 12, sect. 4; Heinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmat. Théologie,* Vol. IX, pp. 7S4 sqq.

SECTION 3

THIRD effect: the blotting out of venial SINS AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE SOUL FROM MORTAL SINS

The Holy Eucharist is not merely a food, it is also a medicine. The Tridentine Council calls it "an antidote, whereby we may be freed from daily faults and be preserved from mortal sins." [1] This twofold effect can be readily understood if viewed in the light of the two central ideas mentioned above, *i. e.* food and medicine.

a) As material food, when used in the proper way, banishes minor bodily weaknesses and preserves man's physical strength, so this food of our souls removes the lesser spiritual ailments and preserves us from spiritual death. The Holy Eucharist is a union based upon love, and as such removes with its purifying flame the stains which adhere to the soul, and at the same time serves as a preventive of grievous sin.

b) The Holy Eucharist preserves the soul from grievous sin by allaying concupiscence *(concupiscentia, fomes peccati)**

1 ". . . *antidotum, quo liberamur a culpis quotidianis [scii, venialibus] et a mortalibus praeservamur."*

» *Cfr. Catech. Roman.. De Eucharistia,* qu. 40: *"Carnis etiam libidinem cohibet ac reprimit."*

This special effect of holy Communion is of great importance for the daily life of the faithful and in the administration of the Sacrament of Penance. Justly, therefore, do spiritual writers recommend frequent Communion as the most effective remedy for impurity, since its powerful influence is felt even after all other means have proved unavailing. Concupiscence is the chief source of mortal sin. Though St. Thomas seems to regard the allaying influence of the Holy Eucharist upon concupiscence as rather indirect,[8] many of the Fathers hold that it is exercised directly by repressing inordinate desires and healing the soul.[9]

c) Whether the Holy Eucharist is directly conducive to the remission of the temporal punishments due to sin, is a disputed question. Most theologians hold with St. Thomas that the Sacrament of the Altar was not instituted as a means of satisfaction. It may safely be assumed, however, that the Eucharist produces an indirect effect in this regard by means of the acts of love which it involves. St. Thomas says: "Because union is the effect of charity, from the fervor of which man obtains forgiveness, not only of guilt but also of punishment, hence it is that as a consequence, and by concomitance with the chief effect, man obtains forgiveness of the punishment;— not indeed of the entire punishment, but according to the measure of his devotion and fervor."[10] Nevertheless some theologians (like Ysambert and

8 Cfr. Suniino *Theol., 3a,* qu. 79, art. 6, ad 3: *"Diminuit fomitem ex quadam consequentia, inquantum auget caritatem, quia, sicut Augustinus dicit, augmentum caritatis est diminutio cupiditatis."*

9 Cfr. St. Chrysostom, *Hom. in loa.,* 46, η. 4: "Si çuir *aestuat, hunc adeat fontem et ardorem temperet;* nam *aestum fugat et adusta omnia refrigerat."*—Other Patristic texts of similar tenor in Tepe, *Inst. Theol.,* Vol. IV, p. 286.

10 *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 79, art. 5: *"Scd quia unitor fit per caritatem, ex cuius fervore aliquis consequitur remissionem non solum culpae, sed etiam poenae, inde est quod*

Tepe0) teach that the Holy Eucharist is directly conducive to the remission of temporal punishments, and in particular that the punishments due to the venial sins forgiven by Holy Communion are wholly, or at least partially, remitted therein.

As regards the effects of grace in behalf of others distinct from the recipient, it is self-evident that the purely personal fruits of Holy Communion,— *e. g.* the increase of sanctifying grace, delight of soul, etc.,—cannot be applied to any but the recipient. Aside from this it is generally held by Catholic divines that the prayers of petition made in the presence of the Eucharistic Lord readily find a hearing and that the fruits of Communion, as a means of satisfaction for sin, may be applied to others, and especially, *per modum suffragii,* to the poor souls in purgatory. A book by Theophilus Renaud, in which the pious custom of offering up holy Communion for the departed was disparaged as superstitious, was put upon the Index.7

ex consequenti per quondam concomitantiam ad principalem effectum homo consequitur remissionem poenae, non quidem totius, sed secundum modum suae devotionis et fervoris."

e Ysambert. *Comment. in S. Theol.,* III, qu. *79,* disp. i. art *7.*— *Tepe, Instit. Theol.. Vol.* IV. p. ,85.

T On the opinion of St. Thomas see the *Summa Theol.,* ja, qu. *79,* art. 7.

SECTION 4

FOURTH effect: the pledge of man's glorious RESURRECTION AND ETERNAL HAPPINESS

"Eternal salvation" and "glorious resurrection" are correlative terms. Being an effective prophylactic against mortal sin,[1] the Holy Eucharist is quite naturally, in the words of the Tridentine Council, "a pledge of our glory to come and everlasting happiness." [2] The emphasis must be laid on the prerogative of our glorious resurrection, which involves eternal happiness.

a) That the Holy Eucharist really and truly effects our glorious resurrection, is plain from Christ's own words, as recorded in the Gospel of St. John: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up in the last day." [3] St. Ignatius of Antioch expresses the common consent of the Fathers when he says: "Breaking bread,[4] . . . is a means of immortality, an antidote against death." [5]

1 *V. supra,* pp. 229 sqq.

* . . pignus *futurae nostrae gloriae el perpetuae felicitatis."* (Sets. XIII, cap. 2).

a John VI, 55.

♦*iprov·*

5 *iarl φάρμακον ἀθανασίαι· ivrlSoros roû μ-ή àiro9aveif· (Ep. ad Ephes.,* 20).— Other Patristic texts *supra,* pp. 71 sq.

b) This fourth effect of holy Communion is shared by the body. Not, of course, as if the material body became the subject of immaterial grace. No; but hy its contact with the Eucharistic species, and hence indirectly with the living Flesh of Christ," the human body becomes, as it were, kin to the glorified Body of our Lord and thereby acquires a moral right to the future resurrection. This right or claim may be compared to that of the Blessed Virgin Mary to be assumed into Heaven. The Mother of God, as the former abode of the Word made flesh, had a moral claim to be bodily taken up into Heaven; similarly the Christian who has received that same Sacred Body in holy Communion, and thereby become its abode, has a claim to rise bodily from the dead.

The question has been raised, whether this is effected by a " physical quality " (Contenson 7) or by a "germ of immortality'' (Heimbucher8) implanted in the body of the communicant. It would profit nothing to enter into so highly speculative a debate. We will merely note that those among the Fathers who speak in exaggerated terms of a " conversion '' of our flesh into that of the God-man, evidently do not mean to assert more than a moral claim to the resurrection of the body.

It was the desire for immortality that gave rise to certain religious practices resembling the Eucharist among pagan nations. The longing of the Greeks for *ambrosia* and *nectar,* the desire of the Iranians to be fed with *haoma,* and the craving of the ancient Hindus to partake of the food of their gods, which they called

soma, no doubt sprang from the natural appetite for divine power and deathlessness which is implanted in every human heart. But as all these notions, as well as the practices inspired by them, are based on Polytheism, they present but an extrinsic analogy with holy Communion.[e]

Readings: —J. B. Dalgairns, *The Holy Communion,* Dublin 1861 (often reprinted).— M. Heimbucber, *Die Wirkungen der hl. Kommunion,* Ratisbon 1884.— C. Jos. Lolinim, *Die sakramentalcn IVirkungen der hl. Eucharistie,* Mayence 1886.— Bodewig, *Der Nutsen der hl. Kommunion,* Mayence 1889.— J. Bellamy, *Les Effets de la Communion,* Paris 1900.— J. C. Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist,* pp. 107 sqq., London 1907.

e On the question whether the Christian Eucharist owes anything to a pagan, or even Jewish, background of Mystery Meals, and if so, what, see W. M. Groton, *The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults,* New York 1914. Dr. Groton (who is a Protestant) shows that there is no sufficient proof that the Eucharist borrowed anything whatsoever from alien cults and that it is overwhelmingly probable that this is not the case.

CHAPTER III

THE NECESSITY OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST FOR SALVATION

The question as to the necessity of the Holy Eucharist for salvation permits of a twofold formulation:

(1) Is it necessary to receive the Eucharist in order to be saved?

(2) Must the Holy Eucharist be received under both kinds?

SECTION 1

IN WHAT SENSE THE HOLY EUCHARIST IS NECESSARY FOR SALVATION

We distinguish two kinds of necessity: (1) the necessity of means *(necessitas medii)* and (2) the necessity of precept *(necessitas praecepti).*

A further pertinent distinction is between *infants* and *adults.*

Thesis I: In the case of infants the Holy Eucharist is not necessary for salvation either as a means or by way of precept.

This thesis embodies an article of faith.

Proof. The dogma stated in our thesis was denied by a few Greek schismatics (Kabasilas, and Simeon of Thessalonica) and by some theologians of the Reformed Church. Rosmini held that Communion is strictly necessary for salvation. He was so firmly convinced of this that he taught that Christ, upon his descent into hell (limbo), personally administered the Sacrament to the patriarchs, and that even to-day infants who die without holy Communion receive it miraculously *in ipso mortis instanti* in the other world. This teaching was formally condemned

by Leo XIII.[1] The Council of Trent had virtually rejected it in advance when it declared: "If anyone saith that the Communion of the Eucharist is necessary for little children before they have arrived at the years of discretion, let him be anathema."[2] As there can be no question of a necessity of *precept* in the case of infants, the Council evidently meant to deny the necessity of *means.*

a) The Biblical argument for our thesis is based on those texts in which eternal life is conditioned solely on Baptism.

Cfr. Mark XVI, 16: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." In conformity with this and similar Gospel texts, St. Paul teaches that "there is no condemnation" *(nihil damnationis)* to them that are baptized in Christ Jesus.[3] All these texts would be false if baptized infants were excluded from Heaven on account of their failure to receive the Holy Eucharist.

b) In studying the Tradition on this subject we must distinguish carefully between theory and practice.

a) From the third to the eleventh century the Latin Church administered the Eucharist to infants under the species of wine immediately after Baptism and Confirmation, as is still the custom among the Greeks and Orien-

1 *Prop. Rosmini Damn, a Leoni XIII, d.* 14 *Dec.* 1887, prop, ja (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. *sqss).*

dirent, parvulis, antequam ad annos esse Eucharistiae communionem, anathema sil." (Denringer-Bannwart n. 937).

3 Rom. VIII, I.

tals. Why did the Church introduce this custom? Did she perhaps believe that infants could not be saved without holy Communion? This is not at all likely. The Church never held Confirmation to be necessary for salvation, yet she administered it to infants. The only Sacrament that she always regarded as absolutely necessary for salvation was Baptism. The Council of Trent declares that the custom of giving holy Communion to children was not based upon the erroneous belief that this Sacrament was necessary for salvation, but upon the circumstances of the times.[4]

/3) The Fathers generally taught that every child dying in baptismal innocence, even without Communion, goes straight to Heaven. The only notable exception appears to be St. Augustine. Petavius, Maldonatus, Schanz, and other eminent theologians do not hesitate to declare his teaching on this point to be out of tune with that of the Church. But this conclusion is hardly warranted. St. Augustine expressly says that "if an infant departs from the present life after he has received Baptism, the guilt in which he was involved by original sin being [thereby] done away, he shall be made perfect in that light of truth which . . . illumines the justified in the presence of their Maker."[6] There are a few passages of the Saint's writings in which he applies John VI, 54 ("Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you") indis-

« Sess. XXI, cap. 4: *"Neque ideo tamen damnanda est antiquitas,* ii cum *morem* in *quibusdam locis aliquando servavit. Ut enim SS. illi Patres sui facti probabilem causam pro illius temporis ratione habuerunt, ita certe eos nullâ salutis necessitate id fecisse sine controversia credendum est."* (Dcnzinger-Bannwart, n. 933).

a *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione,* I, c. 25: *"Vcrumtamen si parvulus percepto baptismo de hac vita migraverit, soluto reatu, cui originaliter obnoxius erat, perficietur illo lumine veritatis"* (Migne. *P. L.,* XLIV, 133).

criminatcly to infants and adults. But we need not necessarily assume a contradiction in St. Augustine's teaching. Preoccupied as he was with the task of disproving the Pelagian distinction between *regnum coelorum* anti ▪*vita aeterna,* the zealous Bishop of Hippo distinguishes between sacramental and spiritual or mystical Communion, and teaches that infants, by the fact of their being united to Christ in Baptism, experience the effect of the Eucharist, *i. e.* spiritual union with Christ *(res sacramenti),* as it were by anticipation, and thus comply with our Lord's command. Baptism he regards as a claim but likewise as a virtual desire to receive the Eucharist. By their anticipatory though purely mystical reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in Baptism, these infants are enabled to partake not only of the *regnum Dei* (John III, 5) promised as an effect of Baptism, but likewise of the *vita aeterna* (John VI, 54) connected with the Holy Eucharist. This, in fact, is Augustine's own explanation of his teaching. "Does not truth proclaim with unfaltering tongue," he asks, "that unbaptized infants not only cannot enter into the kingdom of God, but cannot have everlasting life, except in the Body of Christ, into which, that they may receive incorporation, they are washed in the Sacrament of Baptism?" β

This interpretation of the Saint's teaching is confirmed by a passage in the writings of his faithful disciple St. Fulgentius.' We do not mean to deny, however, that

β *Op. cit.,* III, 4, 8: *"Nonnt veritas tine ulla ambiguitate proclamat,* »10» *solum in regnum Dei non boplisatos parvulos intrare non posse, sed nec vitam aeternam posse habere praeter Christi corpus, cui ut incorporentur sacramento baptismatis imbuuntur?"*

T Asked by the deacon Ferrandus concerning the probable fate of a young man who had died suddenly after Baptism, without having received holy Communion. Fulgentius says: *"Arbitror, sancte fraser, disputationem nostram praeclari D. Augustini sermone Armatam nec*

St. Augustine in his controversies with the Pelagians made some rather extravagant assertions with regard to the necessity of the Blessed Eucharist.

c) From the philosophical point of view the following* considerations are worth pondering. If infants could not be saved without the Eucharist, holy Communion would be necessary to them either as a means or in consequence of a positive precept. It is impossible to assume the latter because infants are not yet amenable to law; or the former, because baptismal innocence can be lost only through mortal sin.[8]

To explain the almost universal custom of the ancient Church of giving Communion to children, theologians discuss the question whether the sacramental grace conferred by Baptism is augmented by the Holy Eucharist. Oswald[0] is inclined to answer this question in the negative; but long before him Suarez declared that the affirmative answer has "the greater weight of authority and reason." Indeed, it would be repugnant to assume that the primitive Church for centuries practiced a custom of which she knew that it was of no benefit to her children. Furthermore, as Baptism has the power of

cuiquam esse aliquatenus ambigendum, tunc unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque Dominici participem fieri, quando in baptismate membrum corporis Christi clhcitur, nec alienari ab eo panis calicisque consortio, etiamsi antequam panem illum comedat et *calicem bibat, de hoc saeculo* in unitate *corporis Christi constitutus abscedat." Ep. 12*

8 Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Scss. XXI, cap. 4: *". . . siquidem per baptismi lavacrum regenerati et Christo incorporali adeptam iam filiorum Dei gratiarum in illa aetate amittere non possunt."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 933).

° *Die Lettre von den hl. Sakramenlen,* Vol. I, $th ed., pp. 491 sq., Munster 1894.

producing sanctifying grace in the soul without the knowledge and will of the baptized infant, what reason is there for assuming that Holy Communion is unable to increase that grace *ex opere operato,* especially since its effects (unlike those of Baptism and Confirmation) are derived from an influence exercised upon body and soul alike by the life-giving Flesh of Jesus Christ?

Thesis II: For adults the reception of the Holy Eucharist is necessary as a matter of precept.

This proposition is likewise *de fide.*

Proof. Communion is prescribed for adult Catholics both by the law of the Church and by a divine command. Cfr. John VI, 54: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

a) In conditioning eternal life upon the reception of His Body and Blood, our Lord obviously meant to give a strict command. There can be no doubt that His precept (Luke XXII, 19): "Do this for a commemoration of me," refers not only to the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice on the part of the priest, but likewise to the reception of the Blessed Sacrament by the faithful, especially since the Apostles were commanded to distribute this Sacrament to all.[10]

It is rather difficult to understand how some theologians can hold that Communion is merely an ecclesiastical precept. The Council of Trent plainly intimates that it is a divine command."

10 1 Cor. XI, *26.*
11 Seaa. XIII. cap. a (Deniinger B.innwar«. n. 8?j).

b) As to the frequency with which He desires us to receive Him in holy Communion, Christ has given no definite precept, and hence this is a matter left to the Church to determine.

Ecclesiastical discipline in this respect has undergone many changes in the course of centuries. The early Christians seem to have observed daily Communion[12] as a strict precept. In the third century, Pope Fabian (236-250) mitigated the former severity of the Church's law to the extent of making the reception of the Eucharist a matter of strict duty only three times a year, *viz.:* at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. The Fourth Council of the Lateran, held under Innocent III (1215), prescribed annual Communion during Easter time as the minimum of obligation.[13] St. Thomas ascribes this ordinance chiefly to "the abounding of iniquity and the growing cold of charity."[14][15]The Lateran law marked the uttermost limit of indulgence to which the Church could go, and hence the Council of Trent did not hesitate to raise the ecclesiastical precept of yearly paschal Communion to the rank of a dogma: "If anyone denieth that all and each of Christ's faithful of both sexes are bound, when they have attained to the years of discretion, to communicate every year, at least at Easter, in accordance with the precept of holy Mother Church, let him be anathema." [10]

Officially the Church has never ceased to proclaim her

12 Cfr. Acts II. 42.

1» *Cone. Lot. IV,* cap. *21* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 437).

14 St. Thomae, Summa *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 80, art. 10, ad 5.— The passage in quotation markers taken from Matth. XXIV, 10.

15 Seas. XIII, can. 9: *"Si quit negaverit, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utriusque sexus, quum ad annos discretionis pervenerint, teneri singulis annis saltem in paschale ad communicandum iuxta praeceptum S. matris Ecclesiae, anathema sit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n.

desire that the faithful should approach the Holy Table more frequently. The Council of Trent declares: "The sacred and holy Synod would fain, indeed, that, at each Mass, the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but also by the sacramental participation of the Eucharist, that thereby a more abundant fruit might be derived to them from this most holy sacrifice." [16]

The famous controversy regarding the *disposition required for frequent and daily Communion* was authoritatively set at rest by the decree *"Sacra Tridentina Synodus,"* issued Dec. 20, 1905, by the late Pope Pius X, through the S. Congregation of the Council. According to this epoch-making document, "frequent and daily Communion, so earnestly desired by Christ and by the Church, should be open to all the faithful," and no one may be denied it "who is in the state of grace and approaches the Holy Table with a right and devout intention. . . . A right intention consists in this: that he who approaches the Holy Table should do so, not out of routine or vainglory or human respect, but for the purpose of pleasing God, of being more closely united with Him by charity, and of seeking this divine remedy for his weaknesses and defects." [17]

In a later decree, "*Quam Singulari,*" of August 10, 1910, the same saintly Pontiff, pointing to the ancient practice of the Church, and with special reference to the Fourth Lateran Council and that of Trent," condemns the practice of postponing the first Communion of

16 Sess. XXII, cap. *6* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 944).

17 The text of the decree in Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 198s sq. An English translation, with a historical sketch and commentary, will be found in J. B. Ferrerez, S. J.. *The Decree on Daily Communion.* tr. by Jimenez, London 1909. Sec also Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist, pp.* tap sqq.. London >907.

18 *Cone. Trident.,* Ses». XIII, can.

children to the tenth, twelfth, or even fourteenth year, and commands that children should be led to the Holy Table as soon as they are able to " distinguish Eucharistic bread from common and material bread." The full use of reason is not required, but merely " a certain knowledge" of the rudiments of faith.[10]

To deprive those of whom our Lord Himself said: " Suffer little children to come to me," of the Holy Eucharist at a time when they are in such great need of this Heavenly Food to strengthen their soul against temptations, and when their reason is sufficiently developed to make them amenable to the divine precept,[20] is little less than a crime.[21]

Thesis HI: The Holy Eucharist is not absolutely necessary for adults as a means of salvation.

This may be set down as a *propositio certa.*

Proof. The Holy Eucharist might be necessary for salvation if Communion by itself constituted a person in the state of grace, or if sanctifying grace could not be preserved without Communion. But neither one of these suppositions is tenable.

a) Communion does not cause justification *(iustificatio prima),* but presupposes the state of sanctifying grace. On the other hand, cases of necessity may arise (e. *g.* on a long sea voyage), in which a person would be

10 Official English version of the " Quam *Singulari,"* together with a commentary, in F. M. De Zulueta. S. J., *Early First Communion,* London 1911.

20 John VI. 50 sqq.

21 Cfr. E. Springer, S. J.. *Die Vorurtcile gegen das Erstkommuniondekret,* Innsbruck 1911; M. Gatterer, S. J., *Die Erstkommunion der Kinder.* Brixen 1911; De Zulueta. S. J., *Early First Communion,* London 1911.

dispensed from receiving Communion, and the sacramental graces of the Eucharist might be supplied by actual graces. It is only when we view the matter in this light that we can understand why the Church in cases of urgent necessity never demands the *votum sacramenti* in regard to the Eucharist, as she does in regard to Baptism and Penance,[22] and why the primitive Church, without going counter to the divine command, withheld the Eucharist from certain sinners even on their death-bed.

b) Some eminent divines, like Suarez,[23] claim that the Eucharist is at least a relatively and morally necessary means of salvation, in the sense that no adult Catholic can sustain his spiritual, supernatural life if he voluntarily neglects to receive holy Communion for a long time. This view is supported by the solemn words which Christ spoke when He promised the Eucharist,[24] by the helplessness and perversity of human nature, subject as it is to many and violent temptations, by the very nature of the Sacrament as the spiritual food and medicine of our souls, and by the daily experience of confessors.

Several of these considerations furnish additional proofs for the wisdom of Pius X in fixing the age when children should be admitted to the Holy Table at about seven years.

Readings:—J. Behringer, *Die hl. Kommunion in ihren ll'irkungen und Hirer Heilsnotwendigkeit,* Ratisbon 1898.

J. B. Ferrcres, S. J., *The Decree on Daily Communion. A Historical Sketih and Commentary,* tr. by H. Jimenez, S. J,, London 1909.— F. M. De Zulueta, S. J., *Early First Communion. A Commentary upon the Decree "Quam Singulari,"* London 1911.— J. C. Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist,* pp. 129 sqq., London 1907.

22 The *votum Eucharistiae* demanded by St. Augustine (v. *surra.* Thesis I) and St. Thomas (S. *Theol.,* 3a. qu. 73. art. 3). ·» ”0« based upon a strict necessity of means. Cfr. De Lugo. *De Eucharistia,* disp. 3. sect ».

23 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 40. sect.

2« Cfr. John VI. $0 sqq.

SECTION 2

COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND

i. Giving the Chalice to the Laity.—So far as we know, a school teacher in Prague, Peter of Dresden, was the first to maintain that Communion under both kinds is necessary for salvation and that the Church wrongs the laity by depriving them of the Chalice.

a) The cry was taken up by the Hussites, under the leadership of Jacob of Misa. Ziska, chief of the Taborites, so-called from their dwelling on a mountain top in Bohemia, set up three hundred tables in order to satisfy the demands of the people for Communion under both species. The Council of Constance (1415), in a decree approved by Martin V (1418), rejected the erroneous teaching of the Utraquists and ordained that the Chalice should not be given to the laity, and that all who obstinately defended the practice were to be regarded as heretics.[1] This led to a revolution and the terrible Hussite wars. To make peace, the Council of Basle (1431) granted the Chalice to the Calixtines of Bohemia under certain conditions, the chief of which was the acknowledgment of Christ's integral presence under either kind?[2]

1 "*Pertinaciter asserentes oppositamquam haeretici arcendi eunt.*" (Üenzinger-Bannwart, η.

2 Denzinger-Bannwart, η. 668.—Cfr. J. B. Hughes, in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* XV, 245.

To this some of the Hussites demurred and in course of time formed the sect of the Moravian Brothers?

b) Utraquism led to new difficulties at the time of the so-called Reformation.

Luther at first maintained a wavering attitude towards the Hussite demand for Communion under both kinds. At times he defended the right of an ecumenical council to decide the question. Then again he claimed that it was for the individual to say whether he wished to receive Communion under the form of bread alone or under both species. As against the Council of Constance the apostate friar of Wittenberg declared that every Christian was free "either to employ both species or only one, or none at all." The Calvinists accused the Catholic Church of mutilating the Sacrament, contemning Christ's command, and betraying the people. Calvin himself did not scruple to denounce the Catholic teaching of the validity of Communion under one kind as a diabolical invention? Utraquism is still a tenet of the Anglican Church, and is enumerated among the *"Plain Reasons Against Joining the Church of Rome"* (London, 1880).

In consequence of the Utraquist agitation, even Catholic nations began to demand Communion *sub ulraque,* so that the German Emperor, with Charles IX of France and other rulers petitioned the Pope and the Council of Trent, which was just then in session, to allow the use of the Chalice in their dominions.

2. The Council of Trent.—The Council of Trent devoted an entire Session to this vexed

s See art. "Unity of the Brethren" in the *New Schatf-Heriog Encyclopedia of Religioni Knowledge,* Vol. XII.

4 *Instit.,* IV. V. 47.

question and defined the Catholic teaching without regard to the noise created by the Utraquists. Its principal canon on the subject is this: "If anyone saith that by the precept of God, or by necessity of salvation, all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both species of the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, let him be anathema."[5]

Only towards the end of the Session did the Council express its willingness to grant the use of the Chalice under certain conditions. Finally, in the last decree of its twenty-second Session, it referred the decision of the whole matter to the Pope. Pius IV, in 1564, authorized the bishops of Austria and Bavaria to permit the use of the Chalice in their dioceses, provided certain conditions were fulfilled; but the people were so slow to make use of the privilege that it was soon after withdrawn. This was the end of Communion under both kinds within the pale of the Church.[0]

3. Catholic Doctrine and Disciplinary Variations.—It is impossible to prove from Scripture that the laity or non-celebrating priests are bound to receive the Holy Eucharist under both kinds. Tradition shows that Communion under one kind has always been practiced within the Catholic Church.

C *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XXI, can. 1: " Si *quii dixerit, ex Dei praecepto vcl necessitate salutis omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem SS. Eucharistiae sacramenti sumere debere, anathema sit."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 934).

0 Cfr. Bossuet, *Traité de la Communion sous les Deux Espèces,* Paris «682.

a) The Utraquists based their contention principally on John VI, 54: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." The Tridentine Council explains this text as follows: "He who said: 'Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you,' (John VI, 54), also said: 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever' (verse 59); and He who said: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life' (verse 55), also said: 'The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world' (verse 52); and, in fine, He who said: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him' (verse 57), said nevertheless: 'He that eateth this bread shall live forever' (verse 59)." [7]

That Communion under one kind was customary in the Apostolic age may be deduced with great probability from Acts II, 42: "And they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers." [8]

b) A very strong argument can be construed from Tradition.

a) In the early days the faithful were accustomed to take the Holy Eucharist home in a wooden receptacle

7 Scss. XXI. cap. I (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 93°>-

8 Act. II. 42: *"Fra"' autem perseverantes* in *doctrina Apostolorum et communicatione fractionis ;anis (rjj κλάβ«ι roi iprov) st oration‣ bus."*— On I Cor. XI, *П* MM. »· *supra,* p. 94- On the text .Matth.

(arca lignea), in order that they might communicate themselves privately from time to time. Tertullian makes this custom the basis of an argument, addressed to his wife, against second marriage with an infidel in case of his own death. His point is that it will be impossible for her to get the pagan husband's permission to take holy Communion at home. "Will he not know," says Tertullian, "what you take secretly before all other food, and seeing it to be bread, will he not believe it to be that which it is said to be [i. *e.* the Body of Christ] ?"[9] St. Basil is authority for the statement that, when the persecutions had ceased, in the fourth century, the custom of taking home a portion of the consecrated bread for private Communion continued to be general in Alexandria and Egypt.[10]

As far back as the third century Communion was given to the sick under one kind only. St. Denis tells of a child bringing Communion to an old man on his death-bed.[11] Paulinus writes that St. Ambrose "received the Lord's Body and died after swallowing it, taking the good viaticum with him."[12] The Eleventh Council of Toledo (A. D. 675) permits the sick who cannot swallow the Sacred Host to receive Communion under the form of wine. Children also were generally given holy Communion under the species of wine alone, sometimes under the species of bread alone.[13]

The so-called Mass of the Presanctified, which is con-

XXVI, 27: *"Bibite ex hoc omnes,"* of which the Lutherans and Calvinists make so much, see Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* IV, 25.

o/ld Uxorem, II, 5 (Migne, *P. L.,* 1, 1206): *"Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes, ct* ai *sciverit esse panem,* non *illum esse crcdct, quid dicitur [scil. corpus Christi]f"*

10 St. Basil, *Ep.* 93 *ad Ccrsariam* (Migne. *P. G.*. XXXII. 483).

11 Cfr. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.,* VI, 44.

12 *De Pita S. Ambrosii,* n. 47.

13 Cfr. St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis,* c. as (cd. Hartel, Vol. I, p. 255),

fined to Good Friday in the West, in the East was and still is celebrated all through Lent, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the Feast of the Annunciation. During this ceremony the officiating priest as well as the people, according to the ancient Roman Ordo, communicated under one kind, *i. e.* bread.[14]

β) An event which happened in the pontificate of Pope Gelasius has furnished a favorite argument to Protestant controversialists ever since Chemnitz. A recent writer refers to it as follows: "Depriving the laity of the Chalice, a practice which Pope Gelasius (-|- 496) had declared to be sacrilegious, first began in the twelfth century and was later justified by scholastic subtleties."[15] Under Pope Gelasius there lived in Rome many unconverted Manichæans, who at public worship took only the Sacred Host and refused the Chalice. To unmask these hypocrites the Pontiff ordained that at public Communion all the faithful without exception should communicate under both kinds. Evidently, before this papal decree was issued, there was no law compelling the laity to take the Chalice, and Communion under the species of bread alone was the common practice.[10] The double usage inaugurated by Pope Gelasius prevailed up to the twelfth century, when the laity was gradually restricted to one kind."

c) A theological argument for our thesis may be drawn from the totality of the Real Presence under either kind."

H Migne, *P. L.,* LXXVIII, 954.

1» Luthardt, *Apologet. Portrage,* Leipzig 1874.

le Other examples in De Augustinis, *Do Re Sacrament.*. Vol. I, and ed., pp. 677 sqq.

17 Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol., 33.* qu. 80. art. n.— On the whole subject-matter of this subdivision see Funk. "*Der Kammuniowtui.* in *Kirchengeicliiclltllehe Abbondlw·· gen unit Unleriuchnngen.* Vol. I, PP· 29.1 sqq.. Paderborn 1897.

is f< *supro.* pp. *93* sqq-

He who communicates under the species of bread alone, truly receives the Flesh and Blood of Christ, *i. c.* the living Christ whole and entire, with Body and Soul, Divinity and Humanity, and together with the whole Sacrament, all the graces necessary for salvation.[10]

It has been objected that the faithful, by being denied the Chalice, are defrauded of a part of the essential fruits of the Eucharist. The reception of the Precious Blood might produce a further increase of sanctifying grace if it were preceded by a new act of devotion and preparation. But whether it would produce this effect without any change in the disposition of the recipient, purely *ex opere operato,* is disputed among theologians. St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, Bellarmine, Suarez, and many other eminent divines hold that the Chalice *per sc* no more confers a larger measure of sanctifying grace than would the taking of two separate Hosts at the same Mass. De Lugo defends the contrary opinion.[20]

That the Church was moved by " weighty and just reasons " when she approved of the custom of communicating under one species, is expressly affirmed by the Council of Trent.[21] These reasons are given by St. Thomas[22] as follows: (i) the difficulty of providing the requisite number of sacred vessels; (2) the danger of spilling the Precious Blood, save in very small and select congregations; and (3) the danger of giving rise to false opinions.

i»Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XXI, cap. 3: ". . . quod *ad fructum attinet,* nullô *gratia neccssariâ ad salutem cos defraudari,* qui κηα>» *speciem solam accipiunt."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 93a).

20 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 12, sect.

21 Sess. XXI, can. 2: *"Si quis dixerit, sanciam Ecclesiam catholicam non {ustis causis ci rationibus adductam fuisse, ut laicos atque etiam clericos non conficientes sub tantummodo specie communi- aut* i» *co errasse, anathema sit."* (Uenzinger-Bannwart, n. 935).

22 *Opusc., 2i, De Sacramento Altaris,* c. 29 (ed. M. de Maria. S. J,, t. III, p. $48, Tiferni Tiberini 1886).

To these reasons Charlier de Gerson, the distinguished theologian who in the early fifteenth century was so prominent a figure at the Council of Constance, in a little dissertation which was read before the Fathers of the Council, added a number of others, to wit: The flanger of soiling the sacred vessels; the inconvenience arising from long beards; the difficulty of keeping the Precious Blood reserved for the sick from fermenting and spoiling; the difficulty of providing vessels large enough to hold the quantity of Blood required at paschal time and other occasions when thousands of persons approach the Holy Table; the impossibility of obtaining wine in poor countries and of providing enough of it where it is very dear; the danger of the wine freezing in northern countries, etc?[23]

Father Sydney F. Smith, S. J., who discusses these reasons at some length in a recent brochure, adds: "Also . . . the people, in these days particularly, might find it hard indeed to drink out of the same chalice as many others, some of whom might be conveying infection through the touch of their lips. Indeed, a correspondence in the columns of the *Times* and *Church Times* during the months of July and August, 1911, has called public attention to the large number of Anglicans who stay away from their Communion for fear of drinking from a chalice which may have been touched by infected lips, or resort to strange and disedifying methods of avoiding the risk. This fear is doubtless exaggerated, but we cannot help feeling that it might spread among Catholics also in these days when so many have microbes on the brain, were we accustomed to receive under both

23 The passage from Gerson is translated and commented upon by S. F. Smith, S. J., *Communion der One Kind,* pp. 18 sq.. London 191>.

kinds." [24] In conclusion the writer touches upon a point to which those who criticize the Catholic practice have probably not adverted: —"Great care has to be taken in the provision of wine so as to secure that it is unadulterated. The wine merchant must be able to inspire trust of himself into the clergy, and the manufacturer into the wine merchant. This acts as a limitation of the wine supply, which, under the intense pressure which a reversion to the old system would involve, would probably cause a crisis."[25]

Readings: —Jak. Hoffmann, *Geschichle der Laienkommunion bis sum Tridentinum,* Spires 1891.— A. Knopfler, *Die Kelchbewegung* in *Bayern unter Herzog Albrecht V.,* 2nd ed., Munich 1887 —O'Kane, *Notes on the Rubrics of the Roman Missal,* Dublin 1867.—'Dublanchy in the *Diet, de Théol. Catholique,* III, 552 sqq.—P. J. Toner in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* IV, 175 sqq.— Sydney F. Smith, S. J., *Communion under One Kind,* London 1911.

24 Smith, *op. at.,* p. 23. 25 *Op. cit.,* pp. 23 sq.

CHAPTER IV

THE MINISTER OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

As we have already noted, the Eucharist is a permanent Sacrament, of which the confection *(confectio)* and reception *(susceptio)* are separated from each other by an interval of time, and consequently there may be two ministers, *vis.:* (i) the minister of consecration and (2) the minister of distribution.

SECTION i

THE MINISTER OF CONSECRATION

I. Heretical Teachings vs. the Doctrine of the Church.—Aside from the Pepuzians, Collyridians, and Montanists of the early Christian era, who attributed priestly powers to women,[1] and the medieval Albigensians and Waldenses, who held that every layman of upright disposition can consecrate,[2] Martin Luther was the first to declare that every Christian is a priest and qualified, as the duly appointed representative of the faithful, to consecrate the Sacrament of the Eucharist.[3]

Against these errors the Church upheld the ancient Catholic teaching that only the regularly ordained priests possess the power of consecrating. The Fourth Lateran Council defined against the Albigenses: "No one but the priest, regularly ordained according to the keys of the Church, can perform this Sacrament."[4] The

1 Cfr. Epiphan., *De Hacr.,* 49, 79.

2 Cfr. the *Professio fidci Waldencibus praescripta,* reproduced by Deniingcr-Bannwart, n. 424.

a He based this teacning on 1 Peu II, 5.

i Caput "Firmiter": "Hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere nisi sacerdos, qui rite fuerit ordinatus secundum claves Ecclesiae." (Dcnzinger Bannwart, ti. 430).

Council of Trent, in opposition to the teaching of Luther, not only confirmed the existence of a special priesthood,[5] but declared that "Christ instituted the Apostles priests and ordained that they and other priests should offer His own Body and Blood."[6]

It follows that no one can consecrate the Eucharist who has not, through the Sacrament of Holy Orders, received from the Church the power to offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass. To consecrate and to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass are reciprocal terms.

2. Proof from Revelation.—To the category of *sacerdotes* belong only bishops *(sacerdotes primi ordinis')* and priests *(sacerdotes secundi ordinis).* Deacons, subdeacons, and laymen *(a fortiori* women) are excluded. That priests alone have the power to consecrate cannot perhaps be proved conclusively from Holy Scripture, but a convincing argument is supplied by Tradition.

a) An indirect argument may be construed from the Bible as follows: Only those can offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and therefore convert bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, to whom He said: "Do this for

5 Sess. XXIII, can. 1.

eScss. XXII. can. *3: "Si quit dixerit, ilhl verbis: 'Hoc facile in meam commemorationem,' Christum* nori *instituisse /ifostolos sacerdotes. aut non ordinasse, ut if·si ahique sacerdotes offerrent eorfus et sanguinem suum, anathema lit."* (Dcniinger-Bannwarl, n. *949).*

a commemoration of me." Now this command was given by our Divine Saviour, not to the faithful in general, but to the Apostles and their successors, *i. c.* the regularly ordained bishops and priests of the Catholic Church. Consequently, only bishops and priests have the power to consecrate.

It is evident that Tradition has understood our Lord's mandate in this sense and in no other. "By the words 'Do this in commemoration of me,'" says the Tridcntine Council, "Christ commanded them [His Apostles] and their successors in the priesthood to offer [His Body and Blood], even as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught."[7] Since the power of consecration and that of offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass are essentially identical, we may cite in support of our thesis the statement of St. Paul: "For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices."[8] If only regularly ordained priests can offer sacrifice, it follows that only regularly ordained priests have the power to consecrate.

b) A careful study of Tradition reveals three facts: (1) Bishops and priests were always held to have the power of saying Mass and consecrating validly; (2) Deacons were never permitted to say Mass or to consecrate; and (3) This prerogative was *a fortiori* denied to clerics in minor orders and to the laity in general.

[7] Sess. XXII, cap. it "Et *eisdem [scii. Apostolis) eorumque successoribus,* ut offerrent, praecepit per *commemorationem,'* uli *semper calholica Ecclesia intellexit et docuit."* (Dcnzinger-Bannwart, n. 938).

[8] e lleb. VIII. 3: "Omnis enim *pontifex ad offerendum munera et hostias constituitur,"*

a) As regards the first point, we know from the writings of St. Justin Martyr, Origen, St. Cyprian, St. John Chrysostom, and others,0 that bishops and priests always appeared as the properly qualified celebrants of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, that the deacons assisted at this function, while the laity participated therein in a merely passive manner. In times of persecution priests often entered prisons under the pretext of paying a visit to the inmates, in order to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice and to strengthen the future martyrs with the Viaticum.

From the early days of the Church the bishop, in administering Holy Orders, employed a special formula to bestow upon the recipient the power of offering sacrifice and of consecrating. In the Latin Ordo this formula ran : *"Accipe potestatem offerendi in Ecclesia sacrificium tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis."*

β) That deacons were always excluded from this function is evident from a decree of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicæa (325) forbidding priests to receive Communion at the hands of deacons, because it is " against discipline and custom " that clerics who lack the power to offer should administer the Holy Eucharist to those who possess that power.10

The Luciferians, among whom there were no bishops or priests, were told by St. Jerome (-|- 420) that for want of celebrants they had neither the sacrifice nor the Eucharist.11

0 See the collection of Patristic texts in Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* diss. 7, art. i, and in De Augustinis, *De Re Sacrament.,* Vol. I, and ed.. pp. 659 sqq.

to *Nicaen. I,* can. 18: *"Nee his,* 7«I *potestatem non hobent offerendi* [i. *e. diaconi}, Uli qui offeruni [«. e. presbyteri} corpus Christi accipiant (oûre ὸ ttaràir aire ἡ σννήΟαια. raptDwKt* τοὺ» *ïζονσίαο μή Ιχοοται rpoa-pépeir rois ηροσφίρονσι bitôrai τό θύμα τοὺ Χριστού)·"*

it *Dial. adv. Lucifer., n.* ai: *"Hilarius* [the founder of the Luciferian sect) *quum diaconus de Ec-*

y) From what we have said it is clear that the Church has always denied to the laity the power to consecrate. St. Epiphanius (-f- 403) charges an ex-monk, Zachæus, with committing a crime because, being a mere layman, he had attempted to say Mass.[12] The Arians who had accused St. Athanasius (-]- 373) of sacrilege because supposedly at his bidding the consecrated chalice had been demolished during a Mass celebrated by a certain Ischyras, withdrew the charge as untenable when it was proved that Ischyras had been invalidly ordained by a pseudo-bishop.[13]

clesia recessent, . . . neque Eucharistiam conficere potest, episcopos et presbyteros non *habens."*

12 *Expos. Fidei,* c. 13: "Quum *esset laicus, attingere ac sacrificia celebrare nefario ac temerario ausu est aggressus."*

18 They had reluctantly to admit, " guum *esset homo privatus* in *privata domo habitans, poculum mysticum habere non potuit."*— Against the contention of Hugo Grotius, that laymen, nay even women, can validly consecrate in case of necessity *(De Cocnae ddminislraticnc, «bi Pastores desunt,* 1637) see Petavius, *Diatribe de Potestate Consecrandi.*

SECTION 2

THE MINISTER OF DISTRIBUTION

The minister of distribution *(minister distribuens)* is he who gives the Sacred Species to the faithful. The Eucharist being a permanent Sacrament, any communicant who has the proper disposition can receive it validly, no matter from whose hands. Hence the question which concerns us here is one not of validity, but merely of the licitness of administration.

i. The Priest as the Ordinary Dispenser of the Sacrament.—Aside from cases of necessity, when the laity were allowed to give themselves Holy Communion, the Church has always upheld it as an Apostolic rule that the Bread of Life should be dispensed only by the consecrated hand of the priest.

That this exclusive prerogative of the priesthood is of divine right, theologians generally deduce from the mandate of Christ: "Do this for a commemoration of me."[1] The deduction is confirmed by the Tridentine Council, which defines: "As to the reception of the Sacrament, it was always a custom in the Church of God that laymen should receive the Communion from priests, but that priests, when celebrating, should com-

[1] Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharùtia,* disp. 73, art t.

municate themselves,— which custom, as coming down from an Apostolic tradition, ought with justice and reason to be maintained."[2] St. Thomas says that "the dispensing of Christ's Body belongs to the priest for three reasons. First, because . . . he consecrates in the person of Christ," and "as the consecration of Christ's Body belongs to the priest, so likewise does the dispensing belong to him. Secondly, because the priest is the appointed intermediary between God and the people; hence as it belongs to him to offer the people's gifts to God, so it belongs to him to deliver consecrated gifts to the people. Thirdly, because out of reverence towards this Sacrament, only consecrated hands should touch it. . . ."[3].

2. The Deacon as the Extraordinary Dispenser of the Sacrament.—The deacon is by virtue of his order the extraordinary dispenser of the Sacrament of the Altar. This is evident from the primitive teaching and practice of the Church both in the East and in the West. The fact that the deacon is an extraordinary minister, shows that he administers the Sacrament not *ex officio,* but *ex delegatione, i. e.* with the permission of the bishop or priest. If he distributes Communion without such permission, he becomes irregular.

2 Sees. XIII, cap. 8: *"In sacramentali autem sumptione semper in cerdotibus communionem acciperent sacerdotes autem celebrantes seipsos communicarent, qui mos tamquam e* traditione apostolica descendens iure ac merito retineri debet."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 881).

8 Summa *Theol.,* 3a. qu. 82, art. *i*·— On the further requisite of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or at least permission, see Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. *72,* sect. 2.

In the early Church the deacons took the Holy Eucharist to those who were absent from divine service * and presented the Chalice to the laity during Mass.' As late as the thirteenth century, deacons were allowed to administer the Chalice, but the Sacred Host only in cases of necessity, at the bidding of bishop or priest.0

That the functions of the deacon with respect to the Holy Eucharist were always regarded as extraordinary and dependent on the permission of bishop or priest, may be seen from the so-called Apostolic Constitutions. In this compilation of ecclesiastical laws, which was long accepted as the work of the Apostles, but is now known to have been made in Syria at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century,7 we read: " The deacon . . . does not baptize, nor offer ; but when the bishop or priest has offered [the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass], he [the deacon] gives to the people, not as a priest, but as one ministering to the priests." 8 When Communion was no longer given to the laity under the species of wine, the deacon's powers became more restricted. According to a decision of the S. Congregation of Rites (Feb. 25, 1777), which is still in force, the deacon may administer Communion in case of necessity, and with the permission of his bishop or pastor,— which permission, however, may be presumed where the necessity is urgent.

4 Cfr. Justin Martyr, *Apol.,* I, c. 67.

6 Cfr. Cyprian, *De Lapsis,* n. 17,

0 Summa *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 8a, art. 3, ad 1: ··. . . ut [diaronus] *dispenset sanguinem, non autem corpus* nui in *necessitate, lubente episcopo vel presbytero."*

7 Cfr. Bardenhewer Shahan, *Patrology,* p. 350, Freiburg and St Louis 1908.

» *Const. elpost.,* VIII, aS (Migne, *P. C.,* 1. na6): *" Diaconus . . . non baptuat. non odert; ipse veto, quum epitcopus vel presbyter obtulit. dal populo non tamquam sacerdos. sed tamquam ministrans sacerdotibus."*— Xn accordance with this is a decree altribuled to the so-called fourth Council of Carthage, A. D. 398 (can. 38), which says: *" Diaconus praesente presbytero Eucharistiam eorpans Chnsti necessitas cogul. misas*

CHAPTER V

THE RECIPIENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

In dealing with the recipient of the Holy Eucharist we must carefully distinguish between the two conditions of objective capacity *(capacitas, aptitudo)* and subjective worthiness *(dignitas).* The former alone belongs to dogmatics; the latter falls within the purview of moral and ascetic theology.

SECTION i

OBJECTIVE CAPACITY

We are here concerned solely with the sacramental reception of the Holy Eucharist, not with the purely physical act of eating and drinking the sacred species, which, *per se,* may be done by persons lacking the necessary moral aptitude.

On the necessity of having the right intention enough has been said in treating the subject of intention generally in a previous volume of this series.[1]

a) The first requisite of capacity or aptitude is that the recipient be a human being. Christ instituted His Sacraments, and especially the Eucharistic food of souls, for mankind only. This condition excludes angels and irrational animals.

The expression " Bread of Angels," which is so often applied to the Blessed Sacrament (it is taken from the Psalms) [2] is a mere metaphor to indicate that the angels feast spiritually upon the God-man in the Beatific Vision, where He is not concealed under the sacramental veil.[3]

1 Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. 196 sqq

2 Ps. LXXV11. as: " *Panem*

3 Cfr. St. Thomas. *Summa Theol.*. ja. qu. 8o. art. *t.*

b) The second requisite of capacity or aptitude for holy Communion is that the recipient be in the state of pilgrimage to the next life *(in statu viatoris).*

We have already adverted to Rosmini's untenable opinion that the Eucharist is miraculously supplied in the next world to children who have departed this life without it.* It would be equally absurd to give holy Communion to the dead,— a practice expressly forbidden by a council of Hippo in the fourth century, on the ground that corpses are no longer capable of eating.0 Strangely enough, this abuse of giving Communion to the dead proved difficult to eradicate, as appears from the energetic measures taken against it by later synods, *e. g.* that of Auxerre, of 578, and the Trullan Council of 692.°

c) The third requisite is Baptism, which by its very concept is the "spiritual door" to all the means of grace administered by the Church.

Were a Jew or a Mohammedan to receive the Sacred Host, he would experience none of the effects of the Sacrament *ex opere operato,* even though he had put himself into the state of sanctifying grace by an act of perfect contrition.4 The catechumens in the ancient Church were strictly excluded from the Table of the Lord.8

4 *V. supra,* pp. 236 sq.

5 Can. 4: *" Placuit* i<t *corporibus defunctorum Eucharistia non detur; dictum est* [enim] *a Domino: 'Accipite et edite/ cadavera autem nec accipere* foisunt nec *edere."*

c Cfr. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* Vol. III, znd ed., p. 585, Freiburg 1877.

t Baptismus flaminis.— *V.* Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, pp. 243 sqq.

8 On the capacity of baptized infants, *v. supra,* pp. 240 sq.; on that of maniacs, idiots, mental defectives, etc., cfr. Familier, *Pastoral-Psyehiatrie,* pp. 165 sqq., Freiburg 1898; see also St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 80, art. 9.

SECTION 2

SUBJECTIVE WORTHINESS

Basing its teaching on that of the Fathers, the Tridentine Council[1] distinguishes a threefold Communion:

(1) Purely sacramental reception, that is, when the Eucharist is received in the state of mortal sin;

(2) Purely spiritual reception, which consists in a mere desire to receive the Holy Eucharist;

(3) Sacramental and spiritual reception by those who are in the state of grace and have the required disposition.

It is only the last-mentioned kind of Communion that produces all the effects peculiar to the Sacrament. It alone can properly be called "worthy Communion."

a) Hence the first and chief condition of subjective worthiness is the state of sanctifying grace *(status gratiae sanctificantis')*.

a) Whoever takes Holy Communion in the state of mortal sin, receives the Body and Blood of our Lord unworthily and commits a sacrilege.

1 Scis. XIII. cap. 8.

Faith alone *(fides informis), i. e.* faith without the dispositions that must accompany it to effect justification, is not sufficient for a worthy reception of the Holy Eucharist. This was expressly defined by the Tridentine Council against the Protestant Reformers: "If anyone saith that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist, let him be anathema." [2] The same Council commands that whoever is guilty of mortal sin must cleanse his soul in the Sacrament of Penance before approaching the Holy Table: "And lest so great a Sacrament be received unworthily, . . . this holy Synod ordains and declares that sacramental confession, when a confessor may be had, is of necessity to be made beforehand by those whose conscience is burdened with mortal sin, how contrite soever they may think themselves." [3]

Unlike the law prescribing the state of grace for those who wish to communicate, the precept enjoining confession is not of divine right, but purely ecclesiastical.

β) In estimating the guilt of unworthy Communion it is necessary to make a distinction. St. Thomas explains this with his wonted lucidity as follows: "One sin can be said to be graver than another in two ways: first of all essentially, second, accidentally. Essentially, in regard to its species, which is taken from its object; and so a sin is greater according as that against which it is committed, is greater. And since Christ's Godhead is greater than His humanity, and His humanity greater than the

2 Sess. XIII, can. n; "Si quis dixerit, solam fidem esse sufficientem *praeparationem ad* sumendum SS. Eucharistiae sacramentum, anathema sii." (Dcnzingcr-Bannwast, n. 893).

"Et tie tantum *sacradigne . . . sumatur, statuit atque declarat ipsa s. Synodus, illis quos conscientia peccati mortalis gravat, quantumcunque etiam se contritos existiment, habita copia confessoris, necessario praemilten-*

Sacraments of His humanity, hence it is that those are the gravest sins which are committed against the Godhead, such as unbelief and blasphemy. The second degree of gravity is held by those sins which are committed against His humanity [such as the kiss of Judas or the crucifixion]. . . . In the third place come sins committed against the Sacraments, which belong to Christ's humanity ; and after these are the other sins committed against mere creatures."[4] Unworthy Communion, being a sin against the greatest of the Sacraments, is no doubt a grave sacrilege ; but it is by no means the most grievous sin that can be committed. Sins com-» mitted against the Godhead of Christ and against His bodily humanity are objectively much more grievous. "This sin," says the Angelic Doctor, speaking of unworthy Communion, "is specifically graver than many others, yet it is not the gravest of them all."[5]

Regarding the matter from the subjective point of view, it is evident that the gravity of a sacrilegious Communion varies in proportion to the malice actuating the unworthy recipient. No doubt one who tramples the Sacred Host under foot commits a more grievous sin than he who simply communicates in the state of mortal sin. And he who approaches this Sacrament unworthily out of malice, is guilty of a far greater crime than he who does so merely from weakness or fear of his sin being discovered.

b) The second requisite of worthy reception is that the recipient must, from the previous mid-

4 Siiiinna *Theol.,* ja, qu. 80. art. 5· 6 *L. c.: "Hoc fcccatuin est mullis aliis gravius secundum suam speciem.* aoa *tumen omninm gravis simum."*

night, abstain from everything in the nature of food or drink *(ieiunium naturale).*0

This precept, which obliges under pain of mortal sin,7 is traced by St. Augustine to an Apostolic ordinance,8 but this contention would be hard to prove.

The reasons for the prohibition of food and drink before Communion are stated as follows by St. Thomas: "First, . . . that it [the Blessed Sacrament] may enter into a mouth not yet contaminated by any food or drink; secondly, because of its signification, *i. e.,* to give us to understand that Christ, who is the reality of this Sacrament, and His charity, ought to be first of all established in our hearts. . . . Thirdly, on account of the danger of vomiting and intemperance, which sometimes arise from over-indulgence in food. . . ." 0

c) In addition to the fast the Church demands a certain preparation. She does not, however, hold that, without such preparation, Communion would fail to work its effects or be unworthy. The only absolutely necessary condition of subjective worthiness is the state of sanctifying grace.

There is no law compelling the faithful, under pain of mortal sin, to approach the Holy Table with a certain definite measure of devotion or previous preparation. Nevertheless, reverence compels us, under pain of venial sin, not to receive our Lord and Saviour without sentiments of sincere devotion.10

e Cfr. Cone. Conrtanlicnic, Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 626.

7 For exceptions to this rule see the text-books of moral and pastoral theology.

β *Ep.* 54 ad *lanuar.,* c. 6.

0 Summa *Thcol.,* 3a' qu. 80, art 8

10 Cfr. De Lugo, *De Eucharistia* disp. 14, sect, a, 3.

To demand more than that would savor of undue rigorism. Pope Alexander VIII, Dec. 7, 1690, condemned the Jansenistic contention that no one should be admitted to the Holy Table who has not made " full reparation '* for his sins, and who is not yet filled with the " purest love of God." 11

The question whether the effects of this Sacrament are impeded by venial sin, is answered by St. Thomas as follows : " Venial sins can be regarded in two ways : first, as past, secondly, as in the act of being committed. Venial sins taken in the first sense do not in any way hinder the effect of this Sacrament. . . . Considered in the second sense, venial sins do not utterly hinder the effect of this Sacrament, but merely in part. For ... the effect of this Sacrament is not only the obtaining of habitual grace or charity, but also a certain actual refreshment of spiritual sweetness, which is indeed hindered if anyone approach this Sacrament with mind distracted through venial sins; but the increase of habitual grace or of charity is not taken away." 12

Readings : — St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 82.— P. Schanz, *Die Lehre von den hl. Sakramenten.* § 35, Freiburg 1893·—P. Morrisroe, art. "Holy Communion," in Vol VII of the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* pp. 402 sq.—A. Devine, C. P., *The Sacraments Explained,* 3rd ed., pp. 217-249, London 1905.

11 Γ. Denzinger-Bannwart, n. >3>2 sq.

12 *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. 79, art. 8·— On the subject of the recipient of the Holy Eucharist the student may further consult P Schaiu, *Die Lehre von den hl. Sahramenten.* J 35, Freiburg 1893.

PART III

THE HOLY EUCHARIST AS A SACRIFICE, OR THE MASS

The Holy Eucharist as a Sacrifice opens up new points of view. Sacrament and Sacrifice are such thoroughly different things that some theologians treat the Mass separately in an entirely different connection.

The Mass is indeed something essentially different from the Eucharist as a Sacrament. Wyclif, Luther, and other heretics retained the latter but repudiated the former.

A Sacrament serves primarily for the sanctification of souls, whereas a Sacrifice has for its object to glorify God by adoration, thanksgiving, prayer, and expiation. The recipient of the one is man, of the other, God, Moreover, the two have distinct modes of being. The Eucharistic Sacrament is a permanent thing *(res permanens}·,* the Mass is a transient act *(actio transiens}.* Finally, the Sacrifice of the Mass requires the consecration of two distinct elements (bread and wine), whereas the Sacrament of the Eucharist may be effected (though only *per accidens}* by the consecration of one element only.

The word " *Missa,"* according to some, is derived from the Hebrew N®, *». e. portion,* according to others from the Greek *μύσκ, i. e. occlusion. Mittere* in the sense of

perficere, offerre sacrum, occurs in the writings of classical authors. But it is more probable that the word *Missa* is a late Latin form of *missio,* as *oblata* from *oblatio, collecta* from *collectio,* etc.[1]

Missio may refer either to the divine mission of the Logos for the reconciliation of mankind,[2] or, by synecdoche, to the "dismissal" of the catechumens in the primitive Church,[3] which has left its traces in the "*Ite missa est.*" The term *Missa* for the Sacrifice of the Altar probably came into common use in the Latin Church as early as the sixth or seventh century. In the East they have retained the older technical term "Liturgy."[4]

The teaching of the Church on the Sacrifice of the Mass, as defined by the Council of Trent, may be treated in three chapters:

I. The Existence of the Mass;
II. The Nature of the Mass;
III. The Causality of the Mass.

General Readings:—St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica,* 3a. qu. 83.— Billuart, *De Eucharistia,* diss. 8 (ed. Lequette, Vol VI, pp.

1 Cfr. Du Cange, *Glossar., s. v. "Missa."*

2 It is thus explained by Rupert of Deutz, *De Divin. Off.,* II, *20.*

3 Cfr. Isid. Hispal., *Etymol.,* VI. 19, 4: *"Missa tempore sacrificii est. quando catechumeni foras mittuntur ... et inde Missa, quia sacramentis altaris intéressé non possunt, qui nondum regenerati noscuntur."* (Migne, *P. L.,* LXXXII, 2J2).

4 Cfr. H. Miiller, *Missa: Vrsprung und Bedeuiung der Benennung,* Aschaffenburg 1873; H. Loewy, *Die myslischen Beseichnungen Jesu Christi ais SiM, SehUoeh und Piscis, insbesondere die Beseichnung der christlichen Opferfeier ais Missa.* Paderborn >888; Kellner, *Heortology.* pp. 430 sqq., London 1908: A. Fortescue, *The Mass.* 4 *Study of the Roman Liturgy,* and ed., London 1913, pp. 399 sqq.; *J. C.* Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist,* new impression. London 1907, pp. >73 sqq.

531 sqq.).—Gregory of Valentia, *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio,* Ingolstadt 1580.— Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* V-VI (ed. Fèvre, Vol. VI, pp. 296 sqq., Paris 1873).— Suarez, *De Sacram. Eucharist. et de Missae Sacrificio,* ed. Paris 1861.— Vasquez, *Comment. in S. Thcol.,* III, disp. 230-231.—*De Lugo, *De SS. Eucharistia,* disp. 19 sqq. (ed. Fournials, Vol. VI, pp. 233 sqq., Paris 1892).— Tanner, *De SS. Missae Sacrificio,* Ingolstadt 1620.—Pasqualigo, *De Sacrificio Novae Legis Quacst. Theologicae, Morales, liiridicae,* 2 vols., Lyons 1662.— Innocent J11, *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio* (Migne, *P. L.,* CCXXVII, 773 sqq.). — Benedict XIV, *De SS. Missae Sacrificio* (Migne, *Thcol. Curs. Complet.,* Vol. XXIII).

Among modern writers: Phil. Hergenrother, *Die Eucharistie als Opfer,* Ratisbon 1868.— Breitenreicher, *Die Sakramente und das hl. Messopfer,* Schaffhausen 1869.— Holzwarth, *Briefe Uber das hl. Messopfer,* Mayence 1873.— Lambrecht, *De SS. Missae Sacrificio,* Louvain 1874.— Menne, *Das allerhciligste Sakramcnl des Altars als Opfer,* Paderborn 1876.— Eisenring, *Das hl. Messopfer,* Einsiedeln 1880.—*Stentrup, S. J., *De Sacrificio Eucharistiae,* Innsbruck 1889.— Businger, *Das unblutige Opfer des Ncuen Blindes,* Solothurn 1890.— Lohmann, *Das Opfer des Neucn Blindes,* 2nd ed., Paderborn 1909.— Sauter, *Das hl. Messopfer,* 3rd ed., Paderborn 1909.—*N. Gihr, *Das hl. Messopfer, dogmatisât, liturgisch und assctisch erklart,* 13th ed., Freiburg 1912; Eng. ed., *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; Dogmatically, Liturgically and Ascetically Explained,* 4th ed., St. Louis 1914· — Many, *Praelectiones de Missa,* Paris 1903.— Gavin, S. J., *The Sacrifice of the Mass,* London 1903.— G. Pierse, *The Mass tn the Infant Church,* Dublin 1909.— Chas. C. Clarke, *Handbook of the Divine* Liturgy. *A Brief Study of the Historical Development of the Mass,* London 1910.— D. Rock, *Hierurgia; or, The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,* Revised by W. H. James Weale, 4th ed., 2 vols., London 1900.— A Devine, *The Sacraments Explained,* 3rd cd., pp. 250 sqq., London 1905.— J. C. Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist,* pp. 147-253, New Impression, London 1907.— G. Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* pp. 62-134, St. Louis 1913.— Wilhelm-Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* Vol. II, 2nd ed., pp. 431-463. London 1901.—S. J. Hunter, S. J., *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology,* Vol. HI, pp. 275-296, London 1894.—L.

Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution,* tr. by M. L. McClure, pp. 46-227, London 191
Mass; A Study of the Roman Liturgy, Second Impression, London 1913.—H. Lucas, *Holy Mass. The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Roman Liturgy,* 2 vols., London 1914,—W *J* Kelly. *The Veiled Majesty of Jesus in the Eucharist,* pp. 175 sqq·. London 1903.

CHAPTER I

THE EXISTENCE OF THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

Before proving that the Mass exists and is a true sacrifice, we must explain the notion of *sacrifice*.

SECTION i

THE NOTION OF SACRIFICE EXPLAINED

ARTICLE I

DEFINITION OF SACRIFICE

I. Figurative Sacrifices.—A "sacrifice," generally speaking, is the offering of a gift to God *(oblatio Dei facta).* In this sense the term may be applied to anything that is offered to the Deity: prayer, obedience, mortification, a good intention, alms, etc.

It is in this general sense that Holy Scripture says: " He that doth mercy, offereth sacrifice."[1]

The Protestant Reformers distorted the Bible when, on the strength of such a figurative use of the term as is found in the above quotation, they contended that the Mass is superfluous. Calvin, however, was honest enough to admit: " I do not understand by what reasoning those are impelled who extend the word sacrifice to all religious ceremonies and actions."[2] In matter of fact it is not at all difficult to show that Holy Scripture employs the term not only in a figurative but also in its strict sense.

1 Ecclus. XXXV, 4: *"Qui facit misericordiam, offert sacrificium."* — On the history of the term ·' sacrifice " in English, see the Oxford *New English Dictionary, s. v.*

2 *Inst.,* IV, 8, 5 13 s *"Qui sacrificii vocabulum ad omnes cerimonias ei religiosas actiones ostendunt, qua ratione id faciant, non video."*

Metaphors like a "sacrifice of jubilation,"[3] "the calves of our lips," a "sacrifice of praise,"[4] expressions which apply sacrificial terms to simple prayer, would be meaningless were there not, or had there not been, a true and real sacrifice *(hostia, θυσία')*. This appears all the more clearly from such comparisons as: "Let my prayer be directed as incense in thy sight,"[5] and such antitheses as: "Obedience is better than sacrifices;"[6] "If thou hadst desired sacrifice, I would indeed have given it: with burnt offerings thou wilt not be delighted: a sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit;"[7] "I desired mercy and not sacrifice."[8] It will be noticed that these texts advert to the sacrificial intent which is essential to every true sacrifice, and without which no sacrifice has value in the eyes of God. This ethical aspect of sacrifice is strongly emphasized by St. Augustine when he says: "A true sacrifice is every good work which is performed in order that we may be in God by a holy association."[9] According to St. Thomas the sacrificial intent, as embodied in the spirit of prayer, is the essential thing.[10]

In a true sacrifice the sacrificial intent naturally does not embody itself in the rite, which can be performed mechanically, but in the purpose, which lifts the external

3 "*Hostia vociferationis.*" (Ps. XXVI, 6).

4 "Pilwii *labiorum.*" (Osee XIV, 3).—"*Hostia laudis.*" (Hcb. XIII, >5).

5 Ps. CXL, a: "*Dirigatur oratio mea sicut* incensum »n *conspectu tuo.*"

6 i Kings XV, 22: "*Melior est enim obedientia quam victimae.*"

7 Pe. L, :8 sq.: "*Si voluisses sacrificium, dedissem utique, holocaustis non delectaberis: sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus.*"

8 Osce VI, *6:* "*Misericordiam volui ct non sacrificium.*"

9 *De Civ. Dei,* X, 6: "*Sacrificium verum est omne opus bonum, quod agitur, ut sanctâ societate inhaereamus Deo.*"

10 Summa *Theol.,* za zae, qu. 85, art. 3, ad 2: "*Primum quidem est bonum animae quod Deo offertur interior» quodam sacrificio per devotionem et orationem et alios huiusmodi interiores actus; et hoc est Principale sacrificium.*"

offering into the spiritual sphere and cannot therefore be attained without an act of the intellect and will.

2. Sacrifices in the True and Proper Sense of the Term.—The definition of sacrifice *(oblatio, προσφορά)* cannot be gained by *a priori* reasoning; it must be ascertained from the comparative history of religions, and, principally, from Divine Revelation. A careful study of these sources shows that four constituent elements enter into the notion of sacrifice. They are:

(a) a sacrificial gift *(res oblata);*
(b) a sacrificing minister *(minister legitimus)* ;
(c) a sacrificial action *(actio sacrifica)* ;
(d) a sacrificial end or object *(finis sacrificii).*

a) The necessity of a sacrificial gift is apparent from the fact that there can be no offering without something that is offered *(res oblata).*

In a true sacrifice, in contrast with figurative sacrifices, the gift must be a physical substance, that is to say, it must be something material and visible *(e. g.* an animal, incense), which is withdrawn from profane use and dedicated in a special manner to God. Cfr. Heb. VIII, 3: "Every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is necessary that he also should have something to offer." [1]

But this is not sufficient. The tithe, the first-fruits, the votive gifts left at miraculous shrines, etc., are physi-

[1] Heb. VIII, 3: *" Omnis enim hostias constituitur.* unrf/ *necetie eit fontifer uj offerendum munera et hunc habere ahgutd quoj orierat "*

cal substances offered to God with a religious intent, but they are not sacrifices. Something more is required.

b) The second requisite is the sacrificing minister *(minister legitimus sacrificii'),* who is usually called priest *{sacerdos, ttp™).*

He must be a qualified person of the male sex. It is of the very notion of public sacrifice that it is offered in the name of the whole community, and no man can act as the representative of a community (family, tribe) unless he has been duly commissioned or called. Whatever may have been the condition of affairs in the state of the law of nature, it is certain that since the Mosaic legislation the exercise of sacrificial functions has been limited to certain authorized persons. The priests of the Old Law were the members of the tribe of Levi. Cfr. Heb. V, 4: "Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was." 12 When King Ozias presumed to offer sacrifices, the Levites reproved him and he was struck with leprosy.13 Christ Himself, the eternal and sole High Priest, did not exercise the sacerdotal ministry by an arrogation of authority, but in virtue of a divine call.14 He has commanded that the priests who represent Him should receive power and authority to offer up the Sacrifice of the New Law through the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Hence it is an axiom in the Catholic Church that there can be no priest without a sacrifice, and no priesthood without the Sacrament of Holy Orders. The Church is not empowered to institute sacrifices. All she has been commissioned to do

12 Heb. V, 4: *" Nee quisquom sumit sibi honorem* [i. *c. sacerdotii), sed qui vocatur* α *Deo tamquum Aaron."* (Cfr. Numb. **III** sqq.).

18 a Par. XXVI, 18 eq(].

is to renew and apply the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross in an unbloody manner to the end of time.

A sacrifice must be offered up at a fixed place, called an altar *(ara, altare).* Such places are found early and in great number among the nations of antiquity.

The question suggests itself, in view of what we have said, whether a visible gift *(e. cj.,* a lamb or the first-fruits of the field), offered on a fixed altar by a regularly ordained priest, would be a true sacrifice.

If God had instituted a sacrifice under this form, it would undoubtedly be a true sacrifice. Viewed in the light of Revelation, however, we find that such an offering would lack an essential constituent of a true sacrifice, *vis.:* the sacrificial act.

c) In the sacrificial act *(actio sacrifica, actio sacrificii)* a sacrifice reaches its outward culmination. Its essence consists in the external offering of the sacrificial gift, which, in turn, must be in some manner transformed, if not completely destroyed. The form of a sacrifice, therefore, lies not in the transformation *(immutatio)* or destruction *(destructio)* of the sacrificial gift, but in its sacrificial offering, no matter how it may be transformed.

a) The sacrificial oblation, consequently, is the physical form, whereas the transformation of the gift is merely the *materia proxima* of the sacrifice. The former is the end and object, the latter a mere means to that end. The correctness of this view can be proved by a threefold argument.

(1) *Sacrificium* comes from *sacrum facere,* in its ac-

tive sense it is synonymous with *offerre* (to offer). Hence to offer is not the same as to transform *{immutare)* or to destroy *{destruere).*[15]

(2) This conclusion is borne out by a study of the Mosaic rite. Under the law of Moses the victim was slain by laymen and temple servants, while the oblation of the blood *{aspersio sanguinis)* was a function reserved to' the lawfully appointed priests. It follows that the slaying of the victim appertains merely to the matter of the sacrifice, whereas the oblation, which consists in the sprinkling of the blood *{aspersio sanguinis),* constitutes its essential form.[10]

(3) The real form of the Sacrifice of the Cross did not consist in the slaying of Christ by His barbarous executioners, nor in an imaginary self-destruction of the Divine Victim, but in His voluntary surrender of His Blood, shed by the hands of others, and in His offering His life for the sins of the world. Consequently, the oblation constitutes the essence of a sacrifice, whereas the destruction of the victim does not.[17]

ft) These arguments do not, however, decide the deeper question whether or not the transformation or, more particularly, the destruction of the victim enters into the definition of a sacrifice *a parte materiae.* We have seen in a previous treatise[18] that the matter of a thing, both remote and proximate, may be as necessary to constitute its nature as the form.

There can be no doubt that the sacrificial gift must be

15 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 73, acct. 5.

10 Cfr. P. Scholz, *Die* III. *Allerturner des Folkes Israel,* Vol. II, pp- >34 «OI·· Ratisbon 1868.—*"Hostia quippe occiditur, ut offeratur,"* says St. Gregory the Great *(Hom. in Etech.,* X. >9)·

IT Cfr. Heb. IX, 14: *"Per Spiritum Sanctum semetipsum obtulit (ιαυτόν προσ·ήνε·γκΐν) immaculatum Deo."—Cfr.* Pohle-Preuss, *Sociology,* pp. sqq

18 Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments.* Vol. I, pp. 59 sqq., IOJ,

in some manner transformed either before the sacrificial action or in the process of the same.1· Is this transformation in the Mass duly accomplished by the Consecration *(sacratio, consecratio),* which transfers the sacrificial gift from profane use to the exclusive service of God, or must there be, in addition, a real change *(mutatio realis)?* If there is need of a physical transformation, must it consist in an improvement of the gift *(mutatio in melius)* or may it consist in a deterioration or the destruction thereof *(mutatio in deterius s. destructio)?* The answer to these questions cannot be obtained by the *a priori* method. Had God so willed, a sacrifice could be consummated by the mere consecration or dedication of the sacrificial gift. But we know from Revelation that such was not His will. We know that the essence of sacrifice requires a real transformation of the *res oblata.* Holy Scripture does not tell us whether this transformation must culminate in destruction. Catholic divines, since Bellarmine and Suarez, hold divergent views on this point. Scheeben20 has pointed out, and Fr. Renz ” proved by a wealth of historical arguments, that the Fathers and the Scholastic theologians of the pre-Tridentine period did not demand the destruction of the victim. However, Bellarmine,22 Vasquez,23 De Lugo,34 and Franzelin20 insist on it. That the idea is recent.

10 Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* 3a, qu. *22,* art. *2: "Sacrificia proprie dicuntur, quando circa res Deo oblatas aliquid fit, sicut quod animalia occidebantur et comburebantur, quod panis frangitur et comeditur et benedicitur. Et hoc ipsum nomen sonat; nam sacrificium dicitur ex hoc quod homo facit aliquid socrum."*— Hence the etymological equation *θύω - fio tsufUoi·,* in Sanscrit: *yag = to otter,* whence arc derived *yagiia = sacrifice,* and *ydgya = sacred* (in the sense of 4?ios>.

20 Dogmatik, Vo). **III,** pp- 400 sqq.. Freiburg 1884.

31 *Ceschichle des Messopferbegriffes, 2* vol·.. Freising 1901-03.

22 *De Eucharistia,* V, ».

33 *Comment, in S. Theol..* 1). disp. *120,* c. *1.*

21 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 19. «act.

as *De Eucharistia, P 11.* the*. 16.

does not, of course, prove that it is false. The necessity of defending the Mass against the Protestant Reformers might have led to the discovery of a new element, which had been overlooked by the theologians of an earlier day. If we add to this that the idea of the complete destruction of the sacrificial victim is realized in a truly imposing manner both in the Mosaic rite and in the Sacrifice of the Cross,— though indeed only *ratione materiae proximae,* — we shall see how reasonable is the assumption that there must be some kind of destruction (and if it were only a self-abasement, or "kenosis," as modern writers might say), in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

De Lugo, whose opinion has been popularized by more than one English writer, expressly admits that the destruction of the sacrificial gift need not be physical but that the idea is sufficiently realized in an act which, according to human estimation, amounts to a certain "exinanition" or self-abasement.[20] We mention this fact, not to prove the truth of De Lugo's theory, but merely to show that it is not improbable, much less impossible.

d) The object or end of the sacrifice *{finis sacrificii),* as significant of its meaning, constitutes its "metaphysical form." In all religions the essential idea of sacrifice is a complete surrender of the creature to God for the purpose of being united with Him.

a) 1'his surrender *{oblatio,* προσφορά) can be regarded from a twofold point of view: (i) as an acknowledgment of God's absolute dominion over man *{agnitio sit-*

MD Eucharistia,* disp. i9, sect. 5, n. 65: . .fo «t ex -..l *sacrihcationis hostia, prout est* in ilhui acllanii h *decliviorem et saltern I,.... desierit."* ' *'ano modo*

fremi dominii') and (2) as man's absolute subjection of himself under God *(absoluta subtectio sub Deo).* The former element embodies mainly the juridical, the latter the ethical element of sacrifice, *i. e.* man's own sanctification as a means of union with God. The two ideas are correlative and postulate each other. Both are based upon the consideration of God as the First Cause and Last End of the created universe.[27]

Hence the obvious inference that sacrifice is essentially an act of divine worship, as God is both the Creator and the final End of all things. To offer sacrifice to a creature would be idolatry.[28] This was understood even by the heathen. St. Augustine remarks: "Who ever thought of offering sacrifice, except to one whom he either knew or thought or imagined to be God?"[29]

Now we are also able to understand why the gift offered as a sacrifice must not only be the property of him who offers it, but by a symbolic substitution vicariously represents man whole and entire, with body and soul, being and life, inasmuch as the sacrificing minister is aware of the absolute dependence upon the First Cause and the direction to the Final End of those for whom he offers sacrifice. This is the essential signification of every sacrifice.

β) To the idea of a complete surrender to God as the essential note of sacrifice, there is added,

27 Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* za zae, qu. 85, art. 3: *" Oblatio sacrificii fit ad aliquid significandum. I . . Anima autem se ofleri Deo in sacrificium sicut principio suae creationis et sicut fini suae beatificationis."*

28 Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.,* ia zac, qu. ioa, art. 3: *" Et quia pertinet ad rectam ordinationem mentis in Deum, ut mens humana non recognoscat alium primum auctorem rerum nisi solum Deum, neque in aliquo alio Unem suum constituat, propter hoc prohibebatur in lege offerri sacrificium alicui alteri nisi Deo secundum illud (Er. XXIt, 39): * Qmi immolat diis, occidetur. praeterquam Domino soli.'"*

29 *De Civ. Dei.* X. 4: *-"Quis sacrificandum cernui! nisi ei, qu*wi deum aut scivit aut putavit aut finsritP "*

on the part of those who are in a state of sin, the desire for pardon and reconciliation.

This idea is based on the knowledge that sin is the greatest impediment of union with God. All the sacrifices of which Bible history tells us, were offered in the state of sin, and consequently had for their object, in part at least, the pardon of sinners and their reconciliation with God. Here, again, the idea of destruction plays an important part, in so far as man, conscious of his guilt and the penalty incurred thereby, prefers to offer such gifts as symbolize his own life, and destroys them by killing or burning. Cfr. Heb. IX, 22: "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." 30

Combining the four constituent ideas thus explained, we may now define a sacrifice as *"the external offering up of a sensible gift, which is destroyed, or at least submitted to an appropriate transformation, by an authorized minister, in recognition of God's supreme dominion and in order to appease His anger."*

In this definition the phrase "the external offering up of a sensible gift" expresses the generic element which

30Heb. IX, 22. *"Sine sanguinis effusione non* fit remiwio."—Cfr. Polile-Prcuss, *Sotcriology,* pp. 112 sqq.; Outram, *De Sacrificiis,* London 1672; J. Pohle, *s.* v. "Sacrifice," in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. XIII.—On the sacrifices of the pagans see Lasaulx, *Die Sühnopfer der Cricchen «nd Ruiner «nd ihr Perhdltnis su dem eincn auf Golgotha,* Wurzburg 1841; Sclianz, *s. v.* "*Opfer"* in the *Kirchenlesikon.* 2nd ed.. Vol. IX.—On the controversy regarding the concept of sacrifice in the primitive Church, cfr. the *Katholik,* of Mayence, 1908, I, pp. 434 sqq., II. 463 sqq.; 1909, I, pp. 125 sqq.; *Zeitschrift far kath. Théologie,* of Innsbruck, i9o8, pp. 3O7 sqq.. Wieland, *Die Schrift 'Mensa* mid *Confessio' mid P. E. Dorsch, S. J* Munich 1908.—On the idea of sacrifice in the Fathers, sec G. Pierse, *The Mass* in *the Infant Church,* pp 37 aqq. 1H

a sacrifice has in common with other acts of divine worship. The remainder sets forth the specific difference which distinguishes a sacrifice from all other religious offerings.

ARTICLE 2

DIFFERENT KINDS OF SACRIFICE

Sacrifices may be divided into four categories according to their object, their origin, their material, and the economy of grace to which they belong.

I. The Object of Sacrifice.—The intrinsic and essential object of every sacrifice, as we have seen, is the acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion over His creatures. Besides this there is a secondary object, *viz.:* the appeasement of His wrath. This secondary object, though in itself purely accidental, has become inseparable from the notion of sacrifice in consequence of the Fall.[1]

The acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion over His creatures culminates in adoration or worship *{adoratio, latria, λατρβία);* the effort to appease His wrath, in contrite expiation for the purpose of obtaining pardon of sin *{propitiatio).* Hence the distinction between sacrifices of praise and sacrifices of propitiation *{sacrificia latreutica et propitiatoria).* And since man receives from God many benefits, his sacrifices have

1 Cfr. Heb. X. 2 aqq.

the additional purpose of thanksgiving and petition *(sacrificia eucharistica ct impetratoria).*

The reason of this fourfold division, according to St. Thomas, is that " man is under obligations to God, in the first place and mainly because of His majesty; secondly because of sins committed; thirdly, because of benefits received, and fourthly, because of benefits still expected." 2 These four objects must not, however, be conceived as separable from one another. There can be no sacrifice of thanksgiving and petition that is not at the same time a sacrifice of praise and propitiation. The specific name of each merely points to the purpose predominant in the mind of the sacrificing minister.

2. Origin of Sacrifice.—To be valid, a sacrifice must be legitimately instituted. It is not, however, necessary, that it be instituted exclusively by God.

" Generally speaking," says St. Thomas, " the obligation of sacrifice is derived from the natural law; and therefore all are agreed on this. But the determination of sacrifices is a matter of human or divine institution, and in this there is a difference of opinion." 3 Vasquez 4 maintained against Suarez that under the law of nature sacrifices might conceivably be instituted by private in-

2 Summa *Theol.,* ia zae, qu. 102, art. 3, ad to: *" Est ratio huius ordinis,* quia *maxime obligatur homo Deo propter cius niaiestatcm, secundo propter offensam commissam, tertio propter cius beneficia* tam susccpta, *quarto propter beneficia sperato."*

3 *Summa Theol.,* 2a aae, qu. 85, art. i, ad 1: *"Obligatio sacrificii* m communi *est dc lege naturali, et ideo in hoc omnes conveniunt. Sed determinatio sacrificiorum est ex institutione humana vel divina, et ideo* in *hoc differunt."*

4 Comment, in S. *Theol.,* III, disp.

dividuals; but this contention was refuted by De Lugo? There can hardly be a doubt that the institution of sacrifices, even in the state of nature, is reserved to authority. Upon this fact is based the division of sacrifices into *arbitraria, i. c.* sacrifices instituted by purely human authority, and *legalia, i. e.* sacrifices instituted by divine authority. Sacrifices of the first-mentioned kind were probably offered by the Patriarchs during the pre-Mosaic period, when there were as yet no *sacrificia legalia* and the offering of sacrifice was a duty imposed on the heads of families. By the written law of Moses Yahweh assumed control of the Jewish religion, prescribed the sacrificial rites in detail, and selected the tribe of Levi as the sole representative of the Old Testament priesthood." Sacrifices offered by others were invalid, and any one not of that tribe who presumed to offer sacrifice, was as "guilty ... as if he had shed blood," and condemned to "perish from the midst of his people."[1]

3. The Material of Sacrifice.—In accordance with the material nature of the sacrificial gift, sacrifices are divided into bloody sacrifices *{victima, hostia, 0vala)f* libations *(libamen,* σ‡Γ0ν-δ«ον), and immolations *(immolatio).*

The material of the bloody sacrifice belonged to the category of domestic animals, which were slaughtered and burnt, either wholly or in part.

Libations, consisting of natural liquids such as wine and oil, were poured out before the altar.

The material of an immolation (from *mala,* sacrificial

5 *Dc Eucharistia,* disp. 19, sect, t, n. 10 sqq.

0 Cfr. Numb. III sqq·. Deut. XVIII.

r Cfr. Lev. XVII. S sqq.

flour) was chosen from solid or liquid articles of human food (incense, salt, etc.), and was always, at least partially, burned.

The sacrificial rites differed widely among different nations.

The most perfect, in fact the only true bloody sacrifice, in matter as well as form, was that offered on the Cross by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who was both the sacrificing minister and the sacrificial lamb.

4. Pre-Mosaic, Mosaic, and Christian Sacrifices.—The history of sacrifices, in revealed religion, may be divided into three periods: (a) the Pre-Mosaic or Patriarchal *{actas patriarcharum s. legis naturae)*·, (b) the Mosaic *{actas legis scriptae s. mosaica)* ; and (c) the Christian *{aetas legis evangelicae s. Christianae).*

a) The sacrifice of the Patriarchal period, in its earliest stage in Paradise, probably consisted in some ceremonial (latreutical) eating of fruit from the Tree of Life, which was a figure of holy Communion. The priest was Adam, the head of the family, not Eve, who was subject to her husband. Through the fall of our first parents the sacrifices they offered to God took on a propitiatory character. The first sacrifice expressly mentioned in the Bible is that of Cain and Abel, consisting of animals and fruits of the field. It is probable that during this early period the sacrificial rite was determined entirely by the Patriarchs, who were the legitimate heads of their tribes, though some theologians hold that certain regulations had been handed down to them from primitive Revelation.

b) The sacrifices of the Mosaic period were partly

bloody and partly unbloody. The latter were merely subsidiary food-offerings?

There were three kinds of bloody sacrifices: burnt offerings, peace offerings, and sin offerings. The burnt offering is called holocaust, because in it the whole victim was made to ascend to God through fire in smoke and vapor.

The unbloody sacrifices consisted in the burning of vegetable substances (incense, flour, bread with salt) or the pouring out of fluids (wine and oil).

Notable among the sacrifices of the Mosaic period were: the sin offering *(sacrificium pro peccato, to irtpl αμαρτίαν, or* simply *peccatum),* the sacrifice of the daily lamb *(iuge sacrificium),* and that of the paschal lamb *(agnus paschalis).*0

A most important function of the Mosaic sacrifice was to serve as a type or figure of the Sacrifice of the Cross. The entire Old Testament, as St. Paul tells us, was nothing but "a shadow of the good things to come." 10 This is true in a special manner of the sacrificial system of the Jews, as the same Apostle explains.11 As the Levitic priesthood was a figure of the one High Priest, Jesus Christ, so the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were a shadow and a type of the one great Sacrifice of the Cross. Being in themselves imperfect and inefficacious, the sacrifices of the Levites could effect a legal "cleansing of the flesh," 12 but no remission of sins."

8 Cfr. Thalhofer, *Die unblutigen Opfcr des mosaischen Kullus* Ratisbon 1848.

0 De Lugo *(De Euch.,* disp. 19, sect. I, n. 9) denied that the *"panes propositionis"* were a true sacrifice; but this assertion is untenable. Cfr. Scholz, *Die hl. Altertiimer des Volkcs Israel,* Vol. II, Ratisbon 1868.

10 Heb. X, 1: *"umbra ... futurorum (σκιά. . ▮ . rue μιλλόοrun)·"*

ii Heb. VIII-X.

>3 ·▮ *Emundatio carnis, τήι σαρκόι καΘαρότηι·"*

13 " *Remissio, Aipsait·"*

Their very insufficiency made them prophetic types of the perfect sacrifice of the New Law. If sins were forgiven in the Old Testament, it was not by the blood of goats or calves, but by the blood of the promised Redeemer. Hence the variety of the Levitic sacrifices and their constant repetition. They were mere types expressing the constant need of propitiation through the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross.[14]

It would not, however, be correct to say that the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were merely typical, mystic, and relative. They had an absolute signification in themselves in so far as they were true sacrifices, instituted for the purpose of worshipping God, appeasing His anger, giving Him thanks, and petitioning Him for further blessings.[15]

c) Christianity knows but one sacrifice, the bloody sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on the Cross and daily repeated in an unbloody manner on our altars.

The Mass is not an independent sacrifice offered by Christ. Nor is it a complement and consummation of the Sacrifice of the Cross. It is merely the unbloody representation and application of the latter, to be continued to the end of time. Both in regard to the sacrificial gift and the sacrificing minister, the Mass is essentially identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross. The only difference between them lies in the manner of of-

14 Cir. Pohlc-Preuss, *Solcriology,* pp. H7 eq.

IB Cir. St Thomas, Summa *Theol.,* ia zae, qu. 102, art. 3: *"Caerimoniae Veterie Legit duplicem camam habebant:* unam «il. *litcralem, secundum quod ordinabantur ad cullum Dei, aliam vero figuraient sive mysticam, secundum quod* ordinabantur ad figurandum Christum."

fering, which in the one is bloody and in the other unbloody.[10]

Protestants contend that Christianity has no sacrifices besides the one offered on Calvary. There are many reasons that speak against this contention. In the first place, there can be no true religion without a sacrifice, and hence Christianity, being preeminently *the* religion, must surely have a perennial sacrifice of its own. Again, the sacrifice of the Cross is truly a world-sacrifice and as such does not belong exclusively to the Christian Church. It was the sole legitimate sacrifice also of all religions of antiquity since the Fall. Yet the professors of the Christian faith, in order to be able to satisfy their duty of worshipping God, must have a permanent sacrifice just as well as the Old Testament Jews. This craving of the heart, which has deeply imbedded itself in all religions, is not satisfied by the Sacrifice of the Cross, since that was offered " once for all " and in one place only. The Catholic Church, being " the mystical Christ," will and must have a sacrifice of her own, because otherwise she could not fulfil her duty of worshipping God in the most perfect manner possible. Without a sacrifice the Christian cult would be inferior to the Levitic ceremonies of the Old Testament, nay even to the feeble manifestations of natural religion as practiced before the Mosaic era.[17]

These considerations, drawn from reason, are confirmed by Divine Revelation, which tells us positively that there is such a sacrifice and that it is to be found in the Mass.

in E. *infra.* Ch. II, Sect, i, pp. 331 sqq.

it Cfr. N. Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Man,* pp. 79 »qq·

Readings:—A. Stockl, *Das Opfcr nach scincm Wesen and seiner Gcschichte,* Mayence 1861.—W. Koppler, *Priester und Opfergabe,* Mayence 1886.— M. Becanus, *De Triplici Sacrificio Naturae, Legis, Gratiae,* (Opusc. II), Lyons 1631.—G. Pierse, *The Mass in the Infant Church,* Dublin 1909.— W. Humphrey, S. J., *The One Mediator, or Sacrifice and Sacraments,* pp. 1-41, London, s. a.—A. Devine, C. P., *The Sacraments Explained,* 3rd ed., pp. 250 sqq., London, 1905.

SECTION 2

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

The Catholic dogma of the Mass is thus defined by the Tridentine Council: "If anyone saith that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, or that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat, let him be anathema." [1] This truth can be convincingly demonstrated both from Scripture and Tradition.

ARTICLE i

THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Old Testament contains many prophecies pointing to the Mass. They are recorded partly in words and partly in types. Chief among the former is the prophecy of Malachias; prominent among the latter is the sacrifice of Melchisedech.

I. The Prophecy of Malachias.—The best and clearest prediction concerning the Mass is un-

[1] Sess. XIII, can. i: *"Si quit dirent, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium aut quod offerri non sit ahud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, anathema sit."* (Dcn/inger· Bannwart. n. 948).

doubtcdly that of Malachias. Its principal passage runs as follows:

"I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts."[1]

According to the Catholic interpretation, the prophet here foretells the everlasting sacrifice of the New Dispensation. The Mass, in the words of the Tridentine Fathers, "is indeed that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice of those that offer [it]; which the Lord foretold by Malachias would be offered everywhere, clean to His name, which was to be great amongst the nations. . . ."[2]

Malachias in the passage quoted predicts two distinct events: (i) the abolition of all Levitical sacrifices, and (2) the institution of an entirely new sacrifice. The only new sacrifice that com-

1 Mal. I, 10 sq.: *"Non est mihi voluntas* in *vobis, dicit Dominus exercituum: et* munus non *suscipiam de* manu *vestra. Ab ortu enim solis usque ad occasum, magnum est nomen meum* in gentibus, cl in omni *loco sacrificatur, et offertur nomini ineo oblatio munda.· quia magnum est nomen meum in gentibus, dicit Dominus exercituum."*

2 *Cone. Trident.,* Scss. XXII, cap. 1: *"Haec illa munda oblatio est, quae nullâ indignitate aut snalitid offerentium inquinari potest, quam Dominus per Malachiam nomini suo, quod magnum futurum esset in gentibus, in omni loco mundam offerendam praedixit."* (Denzinger-Uannwart, n. 939).

plies with the terms of this prediction is the Mass. Consequently Malachias foretold the Mass.

a) The major premise is evident from the text and context. God through the mouth of the prophet accuses the Levitic priesthood of having despised His name by offering polluted bread and blind, lame, and sick animals upon His altar.[3] Angrily He rejects the Levitical sacrifices altogether, declaring that they will be supplanted by a new and clean oblation, which is to be offered not only among the Jews, but likewise " among the gentiles " *(i. e.* heathen, non-Jews), and not only in one determined spot (Jerusalem), but "in every place," *i. e.* throughout the world.

b) The minor premise can be established by showing: (α) that the sacrifice predicted by Malachias was to be instituted in the days of the Messiah; (β) that it was to be a real and true sacrifice, (γ) not formally identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

a) Though the Hebrew participles of the original can be translated by the present tense,[4] the mere universality of the new sacrifice is proof that the prophet beheld as present an event belonging to the future. Whenever Yahweh speaks of His glorification by the "heathen,"[0] He can, according to Old Testament usage, have in mind only the kingdom of the Messiah or the future Church of

3 Mal. I, 7-8: *"Offertis super altLire meum panem pollutum, ei dicitis: In quo polluimus tel In eo quod dicitis: Mensa Domini despecta est. Si offeratis caecum ad immolandum, nonne malum estf ei si offeratis claudum et languidum, nonne malum estf"*

4 They are so translated in our English Bible.

r. Cfr. Ps. XXI. >8: LXXI, 10; U XI. 9; XLIX. 6; LX. 9; Amos IX, 13; Mich. IV, *a,* etc.

Christ. Every other explanation is shattered by the text. Least of all could a new sacrifice in the time of Malachias himself be thought of. Nor could there be any idea of a sacrifice among the heathen of that time, as has been suggested; for the sacrifices of the heathen, associated as they are with idolatry and impurity, are essentially unclean0 and cannot claim to be regarded as true sacrifices because they lack legitimate institution and other necessary attributes. Again, Malachias could not have meant a sacrifice among the dispersed Jews. For, apart from the fact that the existence of such sacrifices in the diaspora is rather problematic, if they did exist they were certainly not offered throughout the world and did not represent a clean and universal oblation in the sense indicated by the prophet. Consequently the reference is undoubtedly to some sacrifice of the future. What was this to be? Was it to be a future sacrifice among genuine heathen, such as the Congo negroes? This is as impossible as in the case of other pagan forms of idolatry. Perhaps, then, it was to be a new and more perfect sacrifice among the Jews? This also is out of the question, for the new sacrifice is to be offered by a priesthood of other than Jewish origin, and, moreover, since the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70), the whole system of Jewish sacrifices is irrevocably a thing of the past.

β) The Messianic sacrifice predicted by Malachias was to be a true sacrifice. Abolition and substitution must correspond, and, accordingly, the Old Testament sacrifices cannot be supplanted by an unreal one, especially in view of the fact that the former were a type of the latter The " good things to come " must have been at least as

β Cfr. I Cor. X. 20: *'· Quae immolant genfee, daemoniis immolant.»*

real as their "shadow." Moreover, such figurative and unreal sacrifices as prayer, adoration, thanksgiving, etc., are far from being a "new" offering, for they are permanent realities common to the sacrifices of both the Old and the New Law. Consequently, the opposition between old and new in the prophecy of Malachias must refer, not to the intrinsic aspects of the sacrifice, but solely to its external rite. All doubt as to the correct interpretation of the passage is dispelled by the Hebrew text. The sacred writer employs no fewer than three distinctively sacerdotal expressions referring to the promised sacrifice, thus designedly doing away with the possibility of taking the term in the metaphorical sense.[7] Especially important is the substantive ΠΠ3Ο, which, although originally the generic term for every sacrifice, was never used to indicate an unreal sacrifice (such as a prayer offering), but became the *terminus technicus* for an unbloody sacrifice in contradistinction to the bloody sacrifice, which is given the name of Π3Ϊ.[8]

y) The sacrifice predicted by Malachias cannot be the Sacrifice of the Cross. The prophet employs the word *ininchah,* which means an unbloody food-offering. The Sacrifice of the Cross, though a true sacrifice, was not an unbloody food-offering. The Sacrifice of the Cross was confined to Golgotha and the Jewish people, and hence was not a universal sacrifice in the sense of Malachias,

[7] *In omni loco suffimentum* (1DpO= partie. Hophal of 1Dp = *suffire, adolere, thurificare) nomini meo, oblatum* (= partie. Hophal of yljj = *offerre, sacrificare) et* [quidem] *sacrificium mundum* (nninp ΠΠ3») The words ηορ in Piel, yljj in Piel and Hipbii, and ΠΠ3Ο· never occur »» Sacred Scripture in the sense of internal sacrifice (e. *g.* prayer), but are always applied to liturgical sacrifices.

[8] Cfr. Knabenbauer, *Comment, tn Profit. Minor.,* Vol. II. pp. sqq., Paris 1886.

i. c. a sacrifice offered " from the rising of the sun to the going down " and " in every place." Moreover, the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was accomplished by the Saviour in person, without the help of a human priesthood, cannot be identified with a sacrifice for the offering of which the Messias employs priests after the manner of the Levites. In the Mass alone is the prophecy of Malachias fulfilled to the letter. In it are united all the characteristics of the promised new sacrifice: its universality in regard to place and time, its extension to all nations, its unbloody sacrificial rite, its delegated priesthood differing from that of the Jews, its power to glorify the name of God throughout the world, its intrinsic dignity and essential purity which no Levitical or moral uncleanness can defile. This is the unanimous teaching of the Fathers.0 Cornelius à Lapide is so impressed with their unanimity that he confidently says: " It is of faith that this clean oblation [of Malachias] is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist." 10

c) This argument is supported by other prophetic references to the Mass in the Old Testament, *e. g.* Psalm XXI and Isaias' prediction of a non-Jewish priesthood for the kingdom of the future Messias.

a) The Messianic character of Psalm XXI *("Deus, Deus meus, respice .in me")* is evident from Matth.

a Cfr. Bcllarminc, *De Eucharistia,* V, to; Pctavius, *De Incarnatione,* XII, ta.

io" De fide esse, hone oblationem mundam esse sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Christi in *Eucharistia."*— On the prophecy of Malachias the student may profitably consult Franzelin, *De Eucharistia,* I'. II, thee, io; Chr. Pesch, *Praelect. Dog-*

V?L X'· "d·· r"· 188

U. Rock, *Hicrurgia; or. The Holy*

XXVII, 46; Mark XV, 34; John XIX, 24; Heh. II. n sq. After describing His suffering on the Cross," the Messias goes on to show what blessings His Passion will bring upon the whole world. In thanksgiving for His rescue from death (on the Last Day) He wishes to " pay his vows." There follows the description of a meal in which not only " the poor shall eat and be filled," but " the fat ones of the earth," too, shall participate. Nay more, even the gentiles shall be benefited.[12] This cannot possibly refer to the Sacrifice of the Cross; it must refer to the Mass.[13]

β) Isaias predicts the terrible judgment of God upon the Jews and the entrance of the heathen into the Messianic Church. Cfr. Is. LXVI, 18 sq.: " I come that I may gather them together with all nations and tongues: and they shall come and shall see my glory. And I will set a sign among them, and I will send of them that shall be saved to the gentiles into the sea, into Africa, and Lydia them that draw the bow: into Italy, and Greece, to the islands afar off, to them that have not heard of me, and have not seen my glory." A characteristic of this new Church will be its non-Jewish priesthood. " And I will take of them to be priests and Levites, saith the Lord."[14] As priest and sacrifice are correlative terms, the new priesthood here prophesied implies an equally permanent sacrifice, and this can only be the Mass.[15]

2. The Sacrifice of Melchisedech a Type of the Mass.—We read in the Book of Genesis:

Sacrifice of the Mars, 4th ed., revised by W. H. J. Weale, Vol. I, pp. 183 sqq., London 1900.

11 Ps. XXI, 1 sqq.

12 Ps. XXI, 27 sqq.

13 Cfr. Prov. IX, 1 sqq.— For a more detailed explanation of Ps. XXI. see Gihr. *The Holy Sacrifice of the Man.* pp. 88 sqq.

14 Is. LXVI. ai.

15 Cfr. Is. XIX, 19.

"But Melchisedech, the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him [Abraham], . . . and [Abraham] gave him the tithes of all." [18]

This bringing forth of bread and wine on the part of Melchisedech was a true sacrifice, and it is on account of this sacrificial act that Melchisedech is regarded as the prototype of Christ at the Last Supper.

a) The Protestants (and some few Catholics) deny that the food-offering of Melchisedech was a true sacrifice. They claim that the verb N'^jn (Hiphil of **. e· °f~ ferebat')* is not a hieratic sacrificial term. The King of Salem, they say, simply brought forth bread and wine to provide refreshment for Abraham and his warriors, who were wearied after battle. But this interpretation is untenable. In the first place, Abraham and his men were well supplied with provisions, for they had taken much booty,[17] and gave "tithes of all." Moreover, it is evident from the context that *proferre* is here used in the sense of *offerre.* Melchisedech is not introduced as Abraham's host, but as "the priest of the most high God," and it is in this capacity that he "brings forth bread and wine," blesses Abraham, and receives tithes from him.[18] Melchisedech's bringing forth bread and wine is stamped as a sacrifice by the fact that it is attributed to his priesthood: *"Erat enim sacerdos."* Had the sacred writer meant to explain Melchisedech's

10 Gen. XIV, 18 sqq.: *"At vero Melchisedech rex Solem, proferens panem et vinum, erat* enim *sacerdos Dei altissimi, benedixit ei* [ecil. *Abrahae·] . . . et [Abraham] dedit ei decimas ex omnibus."*

n Cfr. Gen. XIV. iû.

18 Cfr. Heb. VIII, 4 8qq.

action rather than to give the reason for it, he would have said: " Melchisedech, the king of Salem, who was a priest, brought forth bread and wine." What he does say is: " Melchisedech, the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, *for* he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him," etc. The intermediate sentence, " for he was the priest of the most high God," clearly has reference, not only to the subsequent acts of blessing and receiving the tithe, but mainly to the preceding sacrifice of bread and wine. That the Masorites understood it thus is evident from the fact that they put a period (the so-called Soph-Pasuk) after the clause. Finally, though the verb has several meanings, we are by no means certain that it was never used as a hieratic and sacrificial term; on the contrary, it seems to be so used in Judges VI, 18 sq.[10]

b) Sacred Scripture expressly teaches that Melchisedech, in his capacity of priest, was a prototype of Jesus Christ. In Psalm CIX we read: "Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech."[20] St. Paul refers this directly to our Lord: "So Christ also did not glorify himself, that he might be made a high priest: but he that said unto him: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' as he saith also in another place: 'Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech.' "[21] Christ is here

10 Judges VI, 18 sq.: "Depart not hence, till I return to thee, and bring a sacrifice ( ) and offer it to thee. . . . And he carried (ΧΧ') it under the oak, and presented to

20 " *Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem* («arà *rdj*» ταιιτ) *Melchisedech."*

21 Ileb. V, 5 sq.: *"Christus non*

declared to be not merely a priest like Melchisedech, but "according to the order (κατὰ *την τάξιν)* of Melchisedech." Now Melchisedech, according to the "order" or rite employed, offered an unbloody sacrifice. Hence Christ, being a priest according to the same order, must also offer an unbloody sacrifice. Consequently, Christ resembles His priestly prototype not in His bloody Sacrifice on the Cross, but at the Last Supper, for it is there He made an unbloody food-offering,—only that, as antitype, He accomplished something more than a mere oblation of bread and wine, namely, the sacrifice of His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine. And since He continues this unbloody sacrifice in the Mass and will continue it to the end of the world, He is "a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech." 22

The question may be asked: Why does not St. Paul expressly draw this conclusion in his Epistle to the Hebrews? Why does he omit all mention there of the sacrifice of Melchisedech and the Last Supper? Answer: Because this particular *tertium comparationis* does not fit into his argument. What he aims to show23 is Christ's superiority as a priest over the Old Testament

jemelifium dorifieovie, ui *pontifex fieret, sed* qui *locutus* Ml *ad cum: Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te; quemadmodum ct in alio loco dicit: Tu es sacerdos* in *aeternum* fccundui» *ordinem Melchisedech."* *(Cfr.* Heb. VII, 1 sqq.)

22 Cfr. Bellartninc, *De Eucharistia,* V, 6; De Augustinis, *De Rc Sacramentaria,* Vol. I, and cd., pp. 724 sqq. "

23 Hob. VII, 4 sqq.

Lévites. To establish this he argues as follows: Melchisedech as a priest ranked higher than Aaron. Now Christ is a priest according to the order of Melchisedech. Consequently Christ as a priest ranks higher than Aaron. The superiority of Melchisedech as a priest is manifested not so much by his sacrificing bread and wine (this had a parallel in the Levitic cult), as in the fact that he blessed Abraham and received tithes from him.[24]

The teaching of the Fathers is perfectly clear on this point. St. Cyprian says: "What order, therefore, is this, coming from that sacrifice and going back to it, by which Melchisedech was a priest of the most high God, offered bread and wine, and blessed Abraham? For who is more a priest of the most high God, than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the same that Melchisedech offered, namely, bread and wine, that is, His Body and Blood."[25]

St. Augustine, in spite of the Discipline of the Secret still in force when he wrote, expresses himself with sufficient clearness on the same subject: "They who read know what Melchisedech brought forth when he blessed Abraham, and they participate therein; [for] they behold such a sacrifice now being offered to God throughout the world."[20]

24 Heb. VII, 4.

25 *Ep.* 63 *ad Caecil.,* n. 4: *"Tu cs sacerdos, etc.* Qui *ordo utique hic est de sacrificio illo veniens ct inde descendens, quod Melchisedech sacerdos Dei sumini fuit, quod panem ct vinum obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit. Nam quis magis sacerdos Dei sumini, quam Dominus noster /esus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit ct obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est panem et vinum, suum scii, corpus et sanguinem."*— On St. Cyprian's teaching, cfr. G. Pierse, *The Mass* in *the Infant Church,* pp. 86 sqq.

2β *Contra Adversar. Leg. et Prophet.,* I, 20: *"Noverunt, qui legunt quid protulerit Melchisedech. quando benedixit Abraham et tam sunt participes «mm: vident late sacrificium nunc offerri Dea Ma orbe terrarum."*—*Many* other l*a·tristic passages are quoted by Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* V, 6; see also J. Herington and *J.* Kirk. *The Faith of Catholics on Certain Points of Controversy Confirmed by Scnptnee*

Without wishing to utter a final definition on the subject, the Council of Trent[27] laid stress on the prophetical relation existing between the sacrifice of Melchisedech and the Last Supper.[28]

ARTICLE 2

THE NEW TESTAMENT

The sacrificial character of the Mass can be most convincingly proved from the words which our Divine Saviour employed in consecrating the Chalice.

i. Proof of the Sacrificial Character of the Mass from the Words Employed by Christ in Consecrating the Chalice.—The words spoken by Jesus over the Chalice are reported as follows by the Evangelists and St. Paul:

Matth. XXVI, 28

Τούτο *γάρ ίστιν το αϊμά μου τό τή καινή διαθηκηί το nept* πολλών έκχυννόμίνον ει αφεσιν αμαρτιών.

Hic est enim sanguis meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.

For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.

and Attested by th Fathers.* 3rd ed., Vol. II, pp. 418 sqq., London 1846.

ït Ses». XXII, cap. 1.

28 On the Jewish tradition, cfr. P. Scholz, *Die hl.* <4ltertfimer der *Folkes Israel.* Vol. II, pp. 198 sqq., Ratisbon 1868.— On the Paschal Lamb (cfr. 1 Cor. V, 7 sqq.) as a type of the Mass, *v.* St. Thomas, Summa *Theol.*. 3a, qu. 73, art. 6; Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* V, 7; Bickell, *Messe und Pascha,* Mayence 1872; Von Cichowsky, *Das alttestamentliche Pascha* in *scinem Vcrhaltnis sum Offer Christi,* Munich »849·

Mark XIV, 24

Τούπ> *έστιν το αίμά μου* τή καινή διαθήκη το *ϋπίρ κολλών ίκχυννόμινον.*

Hic est sanguis meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur.

This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many.

Luke XXII, 20

Τούτο το *ποτηριον η καινή* διαθήκη *τν τώ αχματί μου το vir'tp υμών Ικχυννόμΐνον.*

Hic est calix Novum Testamentum in sanguine meo, qui pro vobis fundetur.

This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.

i Cor. XI, 25

Τούτο το *ποτηριον η καινή διαθηκη ίστιν τν τώ Ιμώ αιματι.*

Hic calix Novum Testamentum est in meo sanguine.

This chalice is the New Testament in my blood.

From these texts the divine institution of the Mass can be proved by showing:

(1) That the shedding of blood took place at the Last Supper, and not for the first time on the Cross;

(2) that it was a true sacrifice;

(3) that it was to be a permanent institution in the Church.

Let us consider these points one by one.

(1) That Christ, when He spoke of shedding

His Blood, did not refer to the Sacrifice which He was about to offer on the Cross, but to the sacrifice He was then and there offering at the Last Supper, is evident from the following considerations:

a) The verb is used throughout in the form of the present participle, *ἐκχυννόμενον.* If the Vulgate employs the future tense, it is no doubt to signify that the Sacrifice of the Last Supper is a merely relative sacrifice, based upon and intrinsically related to that of the Cross. Many ancient codices more correctly employ the present, *"effunditur."*[1]

b) The Greek language hardly offers an example of the use of the present participle in a future sense, especially when the finite verb is also used in the present, as here: Τοῦτο ἐστιν . . . ἐκχυνόμενον.

c) It is a rule of New Testament Greek that when the present tense is used both in the participle and the finite verb, as is the case here, the time denoted is not the distant or near future, but strictly the present. This rule does not apply to other constructions of the present tense, as when Christ says (John XIII, 27): "That which thou dost (ποιεῖ), do quickly," or (John XIV, 12): "I go (πορεύομαι) to the Father." That the participle ἐρχόμενον has a future meaning, is due to the notion expressed therein of *coming.* Cfr. James V, 1: *"Miseriae venturae* (ἐπερχόμεναι) Matth. XXVI, 25: ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν *dixit,* forms no exception, because ὁ παραδιδούς is used substantively for "traitor" and the verb is not in the present.

d) The above interpretation is rendered certain by the

[1] Cfr. Knabenbauer, *Comment.* in *Matth.,* Vol. II, p. 424> parj8 jg92

wording of St. Luke, who expressly speaks of the shedding of the blood as taking place in the Chalice, and not on the Cross. He does not say: To *ποτηριον I»* τὼ *αΐμαη ίκχυννομίνγ,* blit : To *ποτηριον tv* τὼ *αΐματι το Ικχυννόμίνον,·— i. e.* the Blood of Christ is shed for you in so far as it is present in the Chalice. Though the Blood in the Chalice was later also shed on the Cross, it would be inaccurate to say that the Chalice of the Blood was shed on the Cross as it was shed at the Last Supper. Since St. Luke, for such a good reason, refers the shedding of the Blood to the present, the participle ἐκχυιτόμβμον in the Gospels of SS. Matthew and Mark must also be interpreted strictly in the present tense.

(2) Even those comparatively few Protestants who, like the Anglicans, hold that the Sacrifice of the Cross was a true sacrifice, readily admit that the phrase, "to shed one's blood for others unto the remission of sins," is not only genuinely Biblical language relating to a sacrifice, but also designates in particular the sacrifice of expiation; only they refer this sacrifice to what took place at the Crucifixion on the following day. We maintain that the shedding of Christ's Blood in the Chalice is as truly a sacrifice as the shedding of it on the Cross, and that our Lord wished to solemnize the Last Supper not merely as a Sacrament, but also as a Eucharistic sacrifice. In other words, the *effusio calicis* signifies not merely a making present of the true Blood of Christ for the purpose of sacramental reception.

but likewise a true, though unbloody offering of that Blood "for many unto remission of sins." If the "pouring out of the Chalice" meant nothing more than the sacramental drinking of the Blood, we should have an intolerable tautology: "Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood, which is being drunk." However, since the text reads: "Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood, which is shed for many unto remission of sins," the double character of the rite as a Sacrament and a sacrifice is unmistakable. The Sacrament is shown forth in the "drinking," the sacrifice in the "shedding of the blood." [2] The "Blood of the New Testament," moreover, of which all four passages speak, has its exact parallel in the analogous institution of the Old Testament through Moses.[3]

(3) The Sacrifice of the Mass was intended to be a permanent institution in the Church. This is made evident by our Saviour's command: "This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me." [4]

The question arises: How can the Lord's Blood be truly shed in the Chalice? Such an unbloody shedding oi blood seems to involve a contradiction.

It is possible and necessary to distinguish a twofold

2 Cfr. Lev. VII. 14; XIV, 17; XVII, 11; Rom. III. 25; V. 9; Heb. IX. 10 sq.—See also Poblc-Preuss, *Sotenology.* pp. 119 sqq.

3 Cfr. Ex. XXIV, 8; Heb. IX, 18.—Maldonatus, *Comment. in ifallh., 26,* 28.

4i Cor. XI, 25; *''Hoc facite* «juoliejcumque *bibetis, in meam commemorationem."*

shedding of blood for sacrificial purposes,— the one real and physical, the other sacramental and mystical. The former took place in the bloody sacrifices of the Old Testament, and also in the Crucifixion, when the Precious Blood of our Saviour actually flowed from His veins and was separated from the Body. When we speak of the sacramental shedding of blood *(effusio sanguinis sacra-inentalis s. mystica)* we mean that Christ offers His Blood for us in so far as it is represented as mystically separated from His Body. This mystic slaying of the Eucharistic Lamb is an imitation and sacramental representation of the physical killing on the Cross. It is in this sense that we must understand the famous saying that the double Consecration is a mystic sword which separates the Blood of Christ from His Body and thereby graphically represents the death of our Lord on the Cross.

2. Proof of the Sacrificial Character of the Mass from the Consecration of the Bread.—As St. Matthew and St. Mark report the words *"Hoc est corpus ineiun"* without any addition, we have to depend entirely on St. Luke and the First Epistle to the Corinthians. These two texts read as follows:

Luke XXII, 19:

Τοὐτο «στι το *σώμα μου το inrip υμών διδόμ(νον^*

Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur.

This is tny body, which is given for you.

i Cor. XI, 24:

Τοὐτο *μου ἰση το σώμα το νκίρ υμών* ζκλώ/xevopl

Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur.

This is niy body, which shall be delivered for you.

a) The present participle *δiδôpcvovt* employed by St. Luke, which the Vulgate this time correctly translates into the present *(datur),* strengthens the argument we have construed above from the Consecration of the Chalice.

The " giving of the body " plainly refers to the Eucharistic Body of Christ present at the Last Supper, and not to His physical Body nailed to the Cross.

The reading *κλώμενον* in St. Paul's text is disputed. Tischendorf and Lachmann in their critical editions omit it altogether, and it is probable that St. Paul wrote: Τοὐτό *μου ἰση το* σώμα το *νπερ υμών.* Since, however, the Apostle shortly before spoke of the " breaking of the bread,"ε and St. Chrysostom read *κλώμ&ον* also in I Cor. XI, 24, there is good reason for regarding the word as Pauline, and we may argue as follows: The Biblical phrase" to break" (κλάν, *frangere),* when applied to food, means to give or offer as food. Now since the physical Body of Christ on the Cross was not allowed to be " broken " after the manner of the Paschal Lamb,0 and most certainly was not given or offered as food to be eaten, the word κλώμ«·ον cannot possibly refer to the Sacrifice of the Cross, but must be applied to the giving of the Body at the Last Supper.

t. l Cor. X. 16: "Αρτοι·, *ἰν* κλώμο*·

U Ex. XII, 46; John XIX, 3a sqq.

b) The giving of the Body of Christ at the Last Supper was a true sacrificial act.

Tradere s. dare corpus pro aliquo in Biblical usage is a distinctly sacrificial term.7 Christ Himself employed it in the discourse in which He promised to institute the Holy Eucharist: "The bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world."8 This excludes the assumption that the Last Supper was merely a "giving" of Christ's Flesh in holy Communion, *i. e.,* a mere Sacrament.

c) The offering of the Eucharistic Body and Blood of Christ was to be a permanent institution in the Church,—the enduring Sacrifice of the New Covenant. This is evident from the Master's command as recorded both by St. Luke and St. Paul: "Do this for a commemoration of me."*

Reischl, Bisping, Zill, and some other exegetes also quote in this connection Heb. XIII, io: "We have an altar *(θυσιαστήριον),* whereof they have no power to eat (φαγιΐν) who serve the tabernacle," arguing therefrom as follows: Where there is an altar, there must also be a sacrifice. Now the only altar whereof Christians eat, is the altar of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Consequently there is a true Eucharistic Sacrifice. This interpretation fits in logically with the text of St. Paul's letter and the ideas contained therein, but it is not entirely certain. St. Thomas, Estius, and others take the Pauline passage

■ Cfr. Rom. VII, 4: Col. I, *3i;* Heb. X. 10; 1 Pet. II, 24. etc.

8 John VI, S®: "· · · PoniJ, *quem ego dabo, caro mea eel fro*

u Luke XXII, 19; i Cor. XI. 24 — On these two passagM see Frame lin. *De Euchariitio.* P. 2. the* 11.

figuratively and apply it to the Sacrifice of the Cross,—"We have the Sacrifice of the Cross, whereof they who serve the tabernacle have no power to eat in a spiritual manner."[10]

ARTICLE 3

THE ARGUMENT FROM PRESCRIPTION

The argument from prescription for the existence of the Mass may be formulated as follows: A sacrificial rite in the Church which is older than the oldest attack made upon it by heretics, cannot possibly be "the work of men or devils," but must have been instituted by Christ. Now the Church's legitimate possession as regards the Mass can be traced back to the beginning of Christianity. It follows that the Mass was instituted by Christ.

The major premise of this syllogism needs no proof. The minor must be demonstrated historically.

i. Since the Council of Trent.—For the last three centuries and a half the teaching of the Tridentine Council has been admittedly accepted throughout the Catholic Church.

The Council devoted its entire twenty-second Session to the Sacrifice of the Mass. We shall give a résumé of the nine canons constituting this definition:

10 Cfr. Thalhofer, Die *Opfcr des JiebrBerbriefcs,* Dillingen i8ss — An intimation of the Mass is seen by many theologians in our Lord's conversation with the Samaritan woman (John IV. 21 sqq.). On this subject see Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* V. ii.

I. The Mass is a true and proper sacrifice.

II. Christ instituted a special priesthood for its celebration.

III. The Mass is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but also a propitiatory sacrifice that may be offered for the living and the dead.

IV. The Sacrifice of the Mass casts no blasphemy on the Sacrifice of the Cross.

V. To celebrate Mass in honor of the saints is not an imposture.

VI. The canon of the Mass does not contain errors.

VII. The ceremonies of the Mass are not an incentive to impiety, but a means of edification.

VIII. Private Masses, wherein the priest alone communicates sacramentally, are lawful.

IX. The rite of the Roman Church, with its silent prayers, its Latin language, its mixture of water with the wine in the chalice before Consecration, is not to be condemned.

These dogmatic definitions palpably reflect a time when the enemies of the Church did not scruple to cover the most sacred things with the filth of their vile imagination. Psychologically, it is quite intelligible that men like Carlstadt, Zwingli, and Oecolampadius should inveigh against altars as *"impias lapidum congeries,"* for they rejected the dogma of the Real Presence. Calvin also was consistent with himself in reviling the "Papistical Mass," which the Catechism of Heidelberg characterized as "cursed idolatry." But it is rather strange that Luther, in spite of his avowed belief in the Holy Eucharist, should have made common cause with the enemies of the Mass and, after a violent "nocturnal dispute with the devil," lent his aid in abolishing it. Melanchthon, who was less radical and more wary, had no objection to letting the

Mass go on as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but denied its propitiatory character. At the time of the Tridentine Council, the Mass seems to have been quite generally abolished among Protestants.[1]

The violence of the Reformers shows how deeply the Mass had taken root in Christendom. Calvin's declaration that the devil had deceived nearly the whole universe into believing in its sacrificial character,[2]* is valid testimony to its existence at his time; so, too, is Luther's complaint that the entire ceremony of the Mass is saturated with the notion of sacrifice.[8]

2. The Middle Ages Since Piiotius.—This period, which extends from the year 869 to about 1500, affords an abundance of testimonies for the existence of the Mass.

Though a number of deplorable abuses originated m the course of this period, and continued well into the sixteenth century, the Mass itself was universally acknowledged in the Catholic Church as a divine institution.[4]* There were some heretical attacks made upon it in the twelfth century. Thus the Albigenses and Waldenses claimed that laymen had the power of offering sacrifice.

[1] The objections raised against it by Luther, Calvin, and Chemnitz *(Examen Cone. Trid.,* cd. Preuss, pp. 381 sqq., Berlin i860 arc copiously refuted by Cardinal Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* V, 24-26.

[2] *elmtit.,* IV, 18: *" Pestilentissimo errore Satan totum paene orbem cxcaecavit, ut crederet Mistam* sacrificium."

[3] a IPeise *christliche Messe»* su *lialten* (1526): *" l'on dem Offertorium* an *klingt unit slinkl altes Opfer, was es ist. . . . Dorum weggeworfen alie IVorte, die nach Opfer klingen, samt dem gonccn Kanonl "*

[4] Cfr. Ad. Franz, *Dic Messe im deutschen Mitlclalter,* Freiburg 1892; J. II. Matthews, *The Mass and its Folklore,* pp. ti sqq., London 1903; T. E. Bridgett, *The Holy Eucharist* in *Creat Britain,* new ed., London I9os; T. J. Carr, *The Blessed Eucharist: Belief of the Early English Church,* Melbourne

In the sixteenth century Wiclif attacked the dogma of the Real Presence. But it is none the less true that the Church succeeded in preserving belief in the Mass among the Christian populace. The Council of Constance (1414-18) condemned Wiclif's assertion that the Mass cannot be proved from Scripture,® quite as vigorously as the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) had rejected the heretical teaching of the Albigenses.®

Taking a long step backward to the schism of Photius (869), we find that the Greek Church held fast to the Eucharistic Sacrifice as faithfully as the Latin. The schismatic Greeks showed in the negotiations for reunion at Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439) that they had kept this precious heritage intact. The German Lutherans tried to induce them to give up the Mass ; but their efforts in this direction were as fruitless as the repeated attempts of the Tübingen divines to persuade them to relinquish their belief in the seven Sacraments.[7] A schismatic council held at Jerusalem, A. D. 1672, refers to the Mass as a true sacrifice of propitiation offered for all the faithful, both living and dead.[8] From all of which it is clear that the Mass existed in both Churches long before Photius.

3. **The Period from** A. D. 300 **to** 800.—Going still farther back, we come upon the Nestorians and Monophysites. These heretics, who were driven out of the Church in the fifth century

5 "*Non est fundamentum in Evangclio, quod Christus Missam ordinaverit."* (Dcnzingcr-Bannwart, n. 585).

β Cfr. Ocnzinger-Bannwart, n. 430.

7 Cfr. Polile-Preuss. *The Sacraments,* Vol. I, p. 39·

« .'t/iud Hardouin, *Concil.,* Vol. XI, p. *347: "Incruentum vero tradidit sacrificium dicens: Accipite st manducate, hoc est corpus meum "* . . . (p. 354): - *Verum ac propitiatorium esse sacrificium, quod pro fidelibus omnibus tum vivis tum defunctis necnon pro utilitate omnium offertur."*

(Ephesus, 431; Chalcedon, 451), have continued to the present day to celebrate in their solemn liturgy the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The Mass was not introduced in the fifth century. This is evident from certain conciliary decrees issued at a still earlier date. Thus the Third Provincial Council of Carthage, in 397, ordained that " nothing be offered in the Sacraments of the Lord's Body and Blood except what the Lord Himself handed down, *i. e.* bread and wine mixed with water.'"[9] The first Nicene Council (325), in its celebrated eighteenth canon, forbade priests to receive the Eucharist from the hands of deacons, for the reason that "neither the canon nor custom have handed down to us, that those who have not the power to offer sacrifice (προσφεραν) may give Christ's Body to those who offer (rois προσφε'ρουσιν)."

The Nicene Council speaks of a " custom." A custom of the fourth century must go back at least to the third, which brings us to the age of the catacombs. Even Harnack admits[10] that the Eucharist was regarded as a true sacrifice in the time of St. Cyprian, who died in 258. Convincing evidence from those early days is furnished by Eucharistic pictures, vessels, missals, altars, etc.[11]

4. The First Three Centuries.—The most conclusive evidence for the existence of the Mass

[9] Cap. 24. *apud* Hardouin, *Concil.,* Vol. I, p. 963: "· · · «· in *sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil amplius offeratur quam ipse Dominus tradidit, hoc est panis et* vinum aqufi tnirlum."

[10] *Dogmcngeschichte,* Vol. I, 3rd ed.. PP· 4=8 sqq.. Freiburg 1894. On Harnack's teaching on this point see Pierse, *The Mass in the Infant Church,* pp. 6-10, Dublin Ï909.

[11] Cfr. Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* VI, 14; Kraus, *Rcalcneyklopâdie der christlichcn Altcrtilmcr,* 2 vole., Freiburg 1879-86; Pierse, *The Mass* in *the Infant Church,* Sect, a, pp. 108 sqq.; Barnes, *The Early Church,* pp. 126 sqq., London 1913.

in the early days of Christianity is furnished by the ancient liturgies. They reach back to the Apostolic age and give unadulterated and decisive expression to the sacrificial idea.

a) According to the well-founded opinion of modern authorities, the liturgies of the East and West may all be traced to one archetype. This in its basic principles is contained in the eighth book of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions,12— a collection which, though somewhat retouched in its present form, was undoubtedly compiled in the first century. The liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions agrees so perfectly with the description given by St. Clement of Rome in his epistle to the Corinthians, that it has been called the Clementine Liturgy.13 Bickell does not hesitate to assert that in its essential characteristics this is the rite employed by Christ Himself at the Last Supper.14

b) In the fourth century the parent liturgy developed into two great families, the Oriental and the Occidental. The Eastern family embraced principally the following:

(1) The Liturgy of Jerusalem,15 which, in the main, is represented in the fifth of the *Catecheses Mystagogicae*

12 *Apud* Daniel, *Cod. Lit.,* IV, 48 sqq., Leipsic 1853.

13 See Thalliofer, *Handbuch der hath. Liturgik,* and ed. by L. Eisenhofer. Vol. II. p. 13, Freiburg 1912. — For additional information on this topic consult Probst, *Liturgie der ersten drei chrisilichen Jahrhunderte.* Tübingen 1870; Idem, *Die attestcn romischcn Sakramentaricn,* Munster 1892.— On the use of this Eastern liturgy in the West see Bickell in Kraus' *Realensyklofiadie der chrisli. Altertümcr.* Vol. II, 310 sqq.

14 Bickell in the *Zeitschrift fir kath. Théologie* (Innsbruck). 18S0, pp. 90 sqq.; Idem, *Messe und Pascha.* Mayence 187t.— Cfr. Drews. *Untcrsuchungen ibcr die sogen. klemcntinische Liturgie,* Leipzig 1906.— On Probst's theory and its modification by Kattenbusch and latterly by Drews, as well as on the subject of the Clementine liturgy in general, see A. Fortescue, *The Mass. A Study of the Roman Lil·urgy,* and ed., London 191J. PP· S7 sqq.

15 *Afud* Daniel, *Cod. Lit·, IV,* 88 sqq.

of St. Cyril (+ 386). It is often called the Liturgy of St. James.[16]

(2) Offshoots of the Liturgy of Jerusalem are the Liturgy' of St. Basil (+ 379) in Cæsarea and of St. Chrysostom in Constantinople (-|- 407), both of which arc still used on certain festival occasions by the Greeks, and also, in an ancient Slavic translation, by the Russians.

(3) The Armenian Liturgy, which is closely related to that of St. Basil.

(4) The Alexandrian Liturgy, also called Liturgy of St. Mark, which forms the basis of the liturgy of the Copts and of the so-called *Canon Universalis* of the Abyssinians.[17]

(5) The Chaldee Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari,[18] used by the Nestorians of Mesopotamia and remarkable for the fact that it does not contain the words of institution. On certain days the Nestorians employ the liturgies of " Theodore the Interpreter " (of Mopsuestia) and of Nestorius.

To the Western family belong:

(1) The Roman Liturgy, which is held to have developed, with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, from the nucleus of the Mass as celebrated by our Lord Himself at the Last Supper. Our present Missal is based on the Sacramentaries of Popes Gclasius I (-}- 496) and Gregory the Great (-|- 6o4).[19]

(2) The Milanese Liturgy, introduced towards the end of the fourth century by St. Ambrose (+ 397). This

10 Cfr. Fortescue, *The Mass.* pp. 81 sqq., 148 sqq.

17 Fortescue, *op. cit.,* p. 97.

18 Fortescue, *op. cit.,* p. 85.

10 The standard work on this subject at present in English is Fortescue, *The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy,* and ed., London 1913· See also IL Lucas. S. J., *The Mass. The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Roman Liturgy,* Vol. I, London 1914.

liturgy is still in use and differs from the Roman only in a few non-essential points.[20]

(3) The Mozarabic Liturgy, also called the Gothico-Spanish, which owes its preservation to Cardinal Ximenes[21] and is remarkable among Western liturgies because it contains an Epiklesis after the Consecration.[22]

(4) The ancient Gallican Liturgy, which is Greek in structure, but extinct since the eighth century.[23]

All these liturgies in their essential characteristics date from the first century and bear indisputable testimony to the sacrificial character of the Mass and its venerable age.[24]

20 Fortescue, *op. cit.,* pp. 106 sq.

21 See Hefcle, *Cardinal Ximenes,* pp. x6r sqq., Tubingen 1844. Ximenes' Missal and Breviary form vols. LXXXV and LXXXVI of Mignc's *Patrologia Latina;* edited by *A.* Lesleus (first edition, Rome 1755).— Cfr. Fortescue, *op. cit.,* p. 105. Λ full description of the Mozarabic Rite will be found in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. X, pp. 611-623 (by Hy. Jenner).

22 The Epiklesis is also found as late as the fifth century in the Gallican, Milanese, and Roman rites.— Cfr. Funk, *Kirchengeschichlliche Abhandlungcn und Untersuchungcn,* Vol. **III,** p. 86, Paderborn 1907.

23 Cfr. Fr. J. Mone, *Lateinische und griechische Messcn ans dem a. (?] bis 6. Jahrhundert,* Frankfort 1850. The Gallican Rite is described very fully by H. Jenner in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. VI, pp. 357-365·

24 Many examples quoted by Chr. Pesch, *Praclect. Dogmal.,* Vol. VI, 3rd ed., pp. 283 sqq.—Cfr. also Kossing, *Liiurgische Erklârung der hl. Messe,* 3rd ed., pp. 104 sqq., Munster 1869; Th. Specht. *Die Wirkungen des eucharistischen Opfers,* pp. 17 sqq., Augsburg 1876; C A. Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies, Chiefly from Original Authorities.* London 1884; F. *E.* Brigbtman. *Liturgies Eastern and Western,* Oxford 1896; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* London 1903; G. Setncria. *La Messa nella sita Storia e net suoi Simboli,* 2nd ed., Rome 1907 (English tr. by E. S. Berry, *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Roman Rite, Ils History and Symbolism. New* York 1911); A. Baumstark. *Liturgia Romana e Liturgia delT Esareato,* Rome 1904; G. Pierse. *The Mass* in *the Infant Church,* pp. ▮68 sqq., Dublin 1909.

ARTICLE 4

THE ARGUMENT FROM TRADITION

The existence of the Mass in the early days of Christianity can also be proved from the writings of the Fathers. It is impossible to quote them all within the limits of this treatise, and hence we shall give a selection of Patristic utterances from the first four centuries.

1. The Apostolic Fathers.—The *Didache,* or *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles,* discovered by Philotheos Bryennios in 1883, was probably composed towards the close of the first century.[1] It clearly attests the Apostolic age of the Mass.

The *Didache* represents the Eucharistic banquet as the unbloody sacrifice predicted by Malachias: "On the Lord's day come together, break bread and perform the Eucharist[2] after confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure.[3] But let none who has a quarrel with his fellow join in your meeting until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled. For this is that [sacrifice] which was spoken by the Lord: 'In every place and time offer me a clean oblation, for I am a great king, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the heathen.'" *

1 Cfr. Bardenhewcr-Shahan, *Patrology.* pp. 19 sqq., Freiburg and St Louis 1908.

2 ἰὐχοριστήσατi.

3 *καθαρά ἡ Ουσία ὕμύν-ι αὕτη γὰρ* [Ουσία! *ἰστίν ἡ ρηθιῖσα ὑπο Κυρίου· ἰν* παντὶ *τόπω καί χρόνω προσφίρειν μοι Ουσίαν καΟαράν* 8τι *βασιλιά! μί"γα! tipi. λίγοι* Kùpios, καὶ τὸ *όνομά μου θαυμαστόν ἰν rois ἴθνοσι-*— Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers,* Vol. 1, p. 331, London 1912. — On the liturgy of the *Didache,* see

St. Ignatius of Antioch (-{- 107), a disciple of the Apostles, says of the Eucharist: " There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for union with His Blood, one altar,5 as there is one bishop with the presbytery and the deacons. . . e And again : " Let no one be deceived: unless a man be within the altar,7 he lacks the bread of God." 8

The famous *Epistula Presbyterorum et Diaconorum Achaiae* on the martyrdom of St. Andrew the Apostle, which was formerly believed to have been written about A. D. 80,9 by his personal disciples and eye-witnesses of the facts, is probably not older than the fifth century.10

2. The Apologists of the Second Century. —St. Justin Martyr (+ 166), in his "Dialogue with Tryphon" 11 says: "The oblation of the wheaten flour . . . was a type12 of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus our Lord commanded to be offered in commemoration of His passion. Of the sacrifices which you [the Jews] formerly offered, God said through Malachias: 'I have no pleasure,' etc. He speaks in advance of the sac-

Semeria-Bcrry, *The Eucharistic Liturgy* in *the Roman Rite,* pp. 53 sqq.. New York 1911.

e îp *θυσιαστήριον*-

β *Ep. ad Philadelph.,* 4.

t ëvrôs θυσιαστηρίον.

8 *Ep. ad Eph..* 5.

0 Gallandi, *Bibl. Pet. Pair.,* Vol. I, Proleg. 4, Venice «765.

10 Cfr. Bardenhewer-Shalian. *Patrology,* p. 104.— In this letter, often quoted by theologians, the proconsul Ægcas is described as commanding St. Andrew to make sacrifice to the gods, whereupon the Apostle replies (c. 6): *" Omnipotenti Deo, qui virus et venu est. ego omni die sacrifico non Ihurts fumum nec taurorum mugientium carnet, nec hircorum sanguinem, ted immaculatum rignum quotidie in altari sacrifico, cuius carnet postquam omnir populut credentium manducavit et sanguinem bibit. Agnus integer perseverat et vivus."*

11 *Dial. c. Tryph.,* c. 41 (Migne, *P. C..* VI, s«4>-

>3 Tiiirof·

rifices 13 which we heathen nations 14 offer to Him in every place,16 that is, of the bread of the Eucharist and likewise of the chalice of the Eucharist, saying at the same time that we glorify His name, while you profane Him."

In the West, Tertullian (b. about i6o) advises those who, for fear of breaking the fast, absent themselves from divine service on the days of the stations, to take the Body of the Lord home with them from the sacrificial altar and consume it after the period of fasting is over. He calls holy Communion " a participation in the sacrifice " which is accomplished " at the altar of God."17 In another treatise he speaks of a real, in contradistinction to a merely metaphorical, "offering up of sacrifice," 17 and in still another, he dwells on the " nourishing power of the Lord's Body " and the renewal of His immolation.18

3. The Fathers of the Third Century.— St. Irenæus of Lyons (+ 202) declares that Christ instituted "the new sacrifice of the New Testament," which the Church regards as the "clean oblation" prophesied by Malachias and offers up to God everywhere.

*3 jrcpl *των Ουσιών·*

'ι qpxis τα Ιθνη.*

is *in* παμτΐ τόπω.— For a critical appreciation oi St. Justin's teaching on the Mass see Picrsc, *The Mass in the Infant Church,* pp. 19 sqq.

is *De Orat.,* c. -19: *"Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steterisf Accepta corpore Domini et reservato utrumque salvum est: et participatio sacrificii et exeeutio oOicii* [fulfilment of the law of fasting]."

it *De Cultu Fem.,* II, 11: *"Aut imbecillus ex fratribus visitandus aut sacrificium offertur aut Dei verbum administratur."*

18 Christ is slain anew *("rursus mactabitur Christus")* to those who arc baptized, and they are noutished *opimitate dominici corporis." (De Pudic.,* c. 9)— On Tertullian's teach·

He writes: "In saying, 'This is my Body,' etc., Christ inculcated the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers up to God throughout the world." 10 According to Irenaeus it is the Church alone that offers a "pure oblation," whereas the Jews "did not receive the Word which is offered to God." 20 The abolition of the Levitic priesthood, he further explains, does not signify that there are to be no more sacrifices, but merely that the "form has been changed." 21

St. Cyprian (-|- 258), in a letter in which he opposes the use of water instead of wine at the Holy Sacrifice, insists on the necessity of carefully following the example of Christ, and continues: "Whence it appears that the Blood of Christ is not offered if there be no wine in the chalice, and that the Lord's Sacrifice is not legitimately celebrated unless our offering and sacrifice correspond to the Passion. . . . That priest truly discharges the office of Christ who imitates what Christ did, and he then offers a true and full sacrifice to God the Father in the Church, when he proceeds to offer it according to the manner in which he sees Christ Himself to have of-

ing see Pierse, *The Mass* in *the Infant Church,* pp. 74 sqq.

19 *Adv. Haer.,* IV, 17, 5: *"Christus dicens: Hoc est corpus meum etc., Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo."*

20 *"Oblationem puram offert."— "ludaei non receperunt Ferbum, quod offertur Deo." (Op. cil.,* IV, 18, 4).

21 *"Non genus oblationum reprobatum est. species immutata est tantum."* (L. *c.).*— Wieland maintains, in the face of vigorous opposition, that the celebration of the Eucharist in the primitive Church bore the character of a common meal and that prior to Irenaeus the Church knew of no real sacrifice, no "oblation" of the Body and Blood of the Lord. On this untenable view see Pohle, article "Mass" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. X, pp. 10 sq.; G. Rauschen. *Eucharist and Penance in the First Sir Centuries of the Church,* pp. 74 sqq.. St. Louis io«j; G. Pierse, *The Mass in the Infant Church,* Dublin 1909.

feted.''[22] This passage proves that St. Cyprian knew of the Mass and regarded it as a true sacrifice.

4. The Fathers of the Fourth Century.—Our most important witness for this period is St. Cyril of Jerusalem (-|- 386), who gives a detailed account of the liturgy of the Mass and draws a clear-cut distinction between the sacrifice itself and the prayers that usually accompany it.

He says: ''After the spiritual sacrifice,[23] the unbloody liturgy,[24] is accomplished [i. *c.* after the Consecration], we pray over this expiatory sacrifice [25] to God for the universal peace of the Churches . . . and for all those in need we pray and offer up this sacrifice.[20] Then we commemorate the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God, through their prayers and intercession, may mercifully receive our supplications. Thereupon we pray for the departed, . . . inasmuch as we believe that it will be of the greatest profit to them [27] if we pray for them in view of this holy and sublime sacrificial gift.[28] We offer up Christ, who was slain for our sins,[29] in order

22 *Ep.* 63 ad *Caecil.,* n. 9, 14 (ed. Hartel, Vol. II, pp. 702 sq.); *" Unde apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici, nec sacrificium dominicum legitimû sanctificatione celebrari, nisi oblatio et sacrificium nostrum responderit* passioni. . . . *Sacerdos vice Christs vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesia Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre, secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse."*— For a critical appreciation of St. Cyprian's teaching sec I'icrse, *The Mass* in *the Infant Church,* pp. 86 sqq.

23 *πνευματική Ουσία-*

24 *αναίμακτο λατρεία.*

25 *ΙπΙ τή Ουσία εκείνη τοϋ Ιλασμοϋ.*

20 ταὐτηρ *προσφίρομεν τήν θυσίαν.*

27 *με-/ίστην 6νησιν ϊσεσθαι.*

26 *τή à-γία καί ψρικωδεστάτη •προκειμίνη Ουσία .*

29 Χρκχτὸρ *Ισφα~/μίνον ὑπίρ των ὑμετίρων αμαρτημάτων προσφίρο-*

to propitiate the benevolent God for those who are already dead, and for ourselves.''[30]

St. Ambrose (-f- 397) lays particular stress on the power of the Catholic priesthood to offer sacrifice. He says: ''We priests imitate Christ, as is our right, by offering the Sacrifice for the people; though we are poor in merits, we become worthy of veneration by the Sacrifice; for though Christ is not now seen offering, yet He is sacrificed on earth, when Christ's Body is offered." "

5. The Fathers of the Fifth Century.—St. John Chrysostom (-F407), who has been justly called the herald of the Eucharist, might with equal propriety be proclaimed the herald of the Mass.

It is upon the Mass that he bases his exalted conception of the dignity of the priesthood: "When you behold how the Lord is sacrificed and laid there as a slain victim,[82] and how the priest stands and prays before the Sacrifice,[83] ... do you still imagine yourself to be among men and on this earth?... When the priest invokes the Holy Ghost and performs the sublime sacrifice,[8*] tell me, how shall we rank him?''[35] The sacrificial victim of the Mass, according to St. Chrysostom, is Christ Himself. "Christ instituted the priestly liturgy,'' transmuted the victim, and ordained that, instead of irra-

so *Catech. Mysi.,* V, n. 8 sqq. (Migne, *P. G.*. XXXIII, ms).

31 *In Pt.,* 38, n. as: *"Sequimur Christum, ut possumus, sacerdotes ut offeramus pro populo sacrificium, etsi infirmi merito, tamen honorabiles sacrificio, quia etsi nunc Christus non videatur [scii, oculis] offerre, tamen ipse offertur* in *terris, quando Christi corpus offertur."*— Other Patristic texts quoted by Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,* pp- too sqq.

3- rôr *Κύριο» rtOupiro» καί Kelperov-*

33 τὸ» *lepfa ἴφιστύτα τύ θύματι.*

3« τήμ *φρικωόίβτάτη» frirehp Ovalav-*

35 *De Sacerdot.,* III, 4.

tional animals, He Himself should be slaughtered."[87] The Mass preserves its unity in spite of the fact that it is repeated daily on innumerable altars. "We always offer the same Victim, and not one lamb to-day, and another to-morrow, but always the same one. . . . Since He is offered as a sacrifice in many places, are there not also many Christs? By no means, for Christ is one and the same everywhere. . . . Now, as He that is sacrificed in many places is one Body, and not many bodies, so also there is but one Sacrifice."[88]

The Protestant contention that St. Augustine (+ 430) favored the "symbolic" theory in regard to the Real Presence,[89] is disproved by his utterances on the Mass. He lays it down as a general principle that there can be no religion without an external cult.[40] In the New Testament all other sacrifices have been supplanted by the Mass, which is the "*summum verumque mysterium*" of the Christian religion, and in which Christ is both the sacrificing Priest and the sacrificial Gift.[41] Physically, he was offered but once, on the Cross; sacramentally, He is daily offered anew for all nations,[42] in commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross.[43] Augustine calls the attention of the Jews to the prophecy of Malaccas and asks them: "What have you to say to this?

87 ιαυτὸρ προσ^ἐρειρ. *(Hom. in I Corinth.,* 24, n. 2).

38 Hom. in *Heb.,* 17, n. 3.— Additional citations from St. Chrysostom in Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mars,* p. 106.— Cfr. also Nagle, Die *Eucharisticlchrc des Id. Chrysostomus,* pp. 148 sqq., Freiburg 1900.

an *I', supra,* pp. 67 sq.

*0 *Contra Faust.,* XIX, 11·. *"In nidlum nomen religionis sen verum seu falsum coagulari homines possunt,* nili *aliquo signaculorum vel sacramentorum visibilium consortio colligantur."*

«*De Civ. Dei,* X, 20: *" lesus Christus sacerdos et ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio, cuius rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesiae sacrificium."*

**3Ep.,* 98, n. 9.

«a *Contra Faust.,* XX, 18: *" Christiani peracti eiusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant sacrosanctd oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Chriiti."*

Open your eyes at last and see how from the rising to the setting of the sun there is offered up the Sacrifice of the Christians; not in one place, as it was ordained among you, but everywhere; not to this God or that, but to the God of Israel, who predicted these things; not according to the order of Aaron, but according to the order of Melchisedech." [44]

In his "Confessions" St. Augustine relates that his pious mother, St. Monica, heard Mass daily, and when she was near death, "only desired that we should make a remembrance of her at Thy altar, at which she had constantly attended without one day's intermission." [45]

Readings:—*G. Bickell, *Messe und Pascha. Der apostolische Ursprung der Messliturgie,* Mayence 1872.—J. M. Buathicr, *Le Sacrifice dans le Dogme Catholique et dans la Vie Chrétienne,* Paris 1889.—*F. Probst, *Die Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform,* Münster 1892.—Idem, *Die abendlandische Messe vom fünften bis sum achten Jahrhundert,* Münster 1896.—*A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter. Beilriige sur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiosen Volkslebens.* Freiburg 1902.—Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio, I: Der Altar der vorkonstantinischen Kirche,* Munich 1906.—Idem, *Der vorirenâische Opferbegriff,* Munich 1909.—Against Wieland. E. Dorsch, S. J., *Der Opfercharakter der Eucharistie einst und jetst,* Innsbruck 1909.—The controversy aroused by Wieland's books, which

44 Adv. ludacos, IX, 13: *"Quid ad haec respondetis? Aperite oculos tandem aliquando et videte, ab oriente sole usque in occidentem non in uno, sicut vobis fuerat constitutum, sed in omni loco offerri sacrificium Christianorum, non cuilibet deo. sed ei qui ista praedixit Deo Israel, nec secundum ordinem Aaron, sed secundum ordinem Melchisedech."*

**6 Confess.,* IX. 13: *"Memoriam sui ad altare tuum fieri desideravit, cui nudius diei praetermissione servierat."*—On St. Augustine's teaching on the Mass see M. M. Wilden, *Die Lehre des hl. Augustinus Uber das Opfer der Eucharistie.* Schaffhausen 1864.—Additional Patristic texts in Petavius. *De Incarnatione,* XII, *12* sqq.: Sclianz. *Die Lehre von den hL Sakramenten.* J 34, Freiburg 1890; Fr. S. Renz. *Der Opfercharakter der Eucharistie nach der Lehre der yliter und Kirchenschriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte,* Paderborn 189a.

were placed on the Index in 1911, is exhaustively reviewed by G. Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church,* pp. 62-98, St. Louis 1913.— A. Fortescue, *The Mass. A Study of the Roman Liturgy,* 2nd cd., London 1913.— A. J. Maas, S. J., *Christ in Type and Prophecy,* 2 vols., New York 1893-5.— L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution,* London 1903.

CHAPTER TI

THE NATURE OF THE MASS

The nature or essence of a thing is either physical or metaphysical. Hence, in dealing with the Mass, we have to answer a twofold question:

(1) What is its physical nature? or in which concrete portions of the liturgy does the real offering take place?

(2) Is the scientific concept of a sacrifice realized in the double Consecration, which, we shall find, constitutes the physical essence of the Mass?

In dealing with the first question we shall show: (1) that the physical essence or nature of the Mass consists in the double Consecration of the species of bread and wine and (2) that the Mass has an intrinsic and essential relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

SECTION i

THE PHYSICAL ESSENCE OF THE MASS

ARTICLE I

THE MASS IN ITS RELATION TO THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS

I. The Sacrifice of the Cross the One Absolute Sacrifice.—The Sacrifice of the Cross is the one absolute sacrifice offered for the salvation of the world, and this in a double sense: (a) in so far as among all the sacrifices of the past and future it alone stands without any relation to, and is independent of, any other; (b) because all graces, means of grace, and sacrifices, in the present economy, derive their power and efficacy from the Sacrifice of the Cross.

a) The Sacrifice of the Cross is called absolute because it is the world-sacrifice *par excellence,* to which all other sacrifices, whether of the Jewish, pagan or Christian economy, are related, and upon which all depend. This is true in particular of the sacrifices of the Old Testament, which, though they had a truly sacrificial character, were but types prefiguring the Sacrifice of the Cross.[1]

[1] F. *tupra,* Ch. I, Sect, i, Art.a.

It is an article of faith that the Mass, though a true sacrifice, is intrinsically and essentially a representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross. The Council of Trent defines: ". . . our God and Lord, though He was about to offer Himself once on the altar of the Cross unto God the Father, . . . that He might leave to His own beloved Spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice, once to be accomplished on the Cross, might be represented, and the memory thereof remain even unto the end of the world, and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit, . . . offered up to God the Father His own Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine." [2]

The very expressions which Holy Scripture employs to show the sacrificial character of the Last Supper (*"corpus tradition pro vobis," "sanguis effusus pro multis"*)[3] point to an intrinsic relation between the Mass and the Sacrifice of the Cross, for it was only in the latter Sacrifice that the "giving of the Body" and the "shedding of the Blood" were physically realized. The

2 Sew. XXII, cap. *Deus et Dominus noster, etsi seipsum* in *ara crucis morte intercedente Deo Patri oblaturus erat, . . . ut dilectae sponsae suae Ecclesiae visibile, sicut hominum natquo cruentum illud semel in cruce peragendum repraesentaretur eius-que memoria* in *finem usque saeculi permaneret atque Uhus salutaris virtus in remissionem eorum, quae a nobis quotidie committuntur, peccatorum applicaretur, . . . corpus et sanguinem suum sub speelebus panis et vini Deo Paln obtulit."* (Deniingcr-ltaniiwart. n. pj8).

3 *P. supra,* Ch. 1, Sect, a, Art. a.

Vulgate, in translating the Greek text by "*Corpus quod pro vobis tradetur*" and "*sanguis qui pro multis effundetur,*" brings out this intrinsic relation by using the future tense. After the consummation of the Sacrifice of the Cross this relation, which had up to then been anticipatory, became retrospective.

St. Paul places Christ's command, "Do this for a commemoration of me,"[4] into direct relation with His death on the Cross, when he says: . . You shall show the death of the Lord, until He come."[6]

The character of the Mass, as a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross, manifests itself externally in the twofold Consecration of the bread and wine. This ceremony illustrates and symbolizes the physical separation of the Blood from the Body which took place on the Cross.®

The Fathers regard the Mass as a representation and renewal of the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross. St. Cyprian says that the Sacrifice of the Lord is not celebrated unless our oblation corresponds to the Sacrifice of the Cross.[7] St. Ambrose writes: "Formerly a lamb was offered, . . . now Christ is offered, but He is offered as if renewing His passion."[8]* St. Gregory the Great: "Let us consider, what kind of sacrifice this

4 Luke XXII, 19.

Bi Cor. XI, 26: "*Mortem Domini annuntiabitis, donec veniat.*"

7 *Ep.* 63, η. 9 (ed. Hartci, II, 708): "*Apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici, nec sacrificium dominicum legitimâ sanctificatione celebrari, nisi oblatio et sacrificium nostrum responderit passioni. Passio est enim Domini sacrificium, quod offerimus. Nihil aliud quam quod ille fecit, facere debemus.*"

8 De Offic., I, 48: "*Ante agnus offerebatur, . . . nunc Christus offertur, sed offertur quasi recipiens passionem.*"— On the teaching of St. Augustine (*Conlr. Faust.,* XX, 18), *v. supra,* pp. 328 Sq.

is for us, which for the remission of our sins constantly imitates the Passion of the only-begotten Son.''[9]

The relation of the Mass to the Sacrifice of the Cross stands forth clearly in the various liturgies.

The teaching of Scholastic theology is authoritatively voiced by St. Thomas, who says in the third part of the *Summa:* ''As the celebration of this Sacrament is an image representing Christ's Passion, so the altar is representative of the Cross itself, upon which Christ was sacrificed in His proper species.'' [10]

The same idea is beautifully illustrated by certain medieval paintings, which show the Precious Blood flowing from the side of our Divine Saviour into a chalice standing on the altar.

b) The Sacrifice of the Cross is the one absolute sacrifice also in this sense that in it the Redemption of the human race was once for all accomplished and consummated in such a way that all other sacrifices and means of grace are empty, barren, and void of effect unless they are supplied from the main stream of merits derived from the suffering of the crucified Redeemer. This is a fundamental dogma of the Christian religion, in regard to which Catholics and believing Protestants agree. The uniqueness and universality of the Sacrifice of the Cross are shown by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews: '' By his own blood [Christ] entered once into the holies, having obtained eternal redemption.''[11]* There is no

» *Dial.,* IV, 58: *"Pensemus, quale sit pro nobis hoc sacrificium, quod pro absolutione nostra passionem unigeniti Filii semper imitapassionis Christi, ita altare est repraesentatiium crucis ipsius, in qua Christus in propria specie immolatus est."*

10 *Summa Theol.,* ja, qu. 83. art. t, ad 2: *"Sicut celebratio huius sacramenti est imago repraesentativa*

11 Heb. IX. 12: *"Per proprium sanguinem introivit semel in sancio, aeterna redemptione inventi."*

redemption for him who spurns the Sacrifice of the Cross. " For if we sin wilfully after having the knowledge of the truth, there is now left no sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful expectation of judgment." [12]

It would be wrong, however, to conclude from these texts that the Mass is superfluous or that it derogates from the Sacrifice of the Cross. The Council of Trent declares: "If anyone saith that the Sacrifice of the Mass casts a blasphemy upon the most holy Sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross, or that it derogates from it, let him be anathema." [13] The Mass is not something independent of the Sacrifice of the Cross; nor does it pretend to add new power or efficacy to that Sacrifice. The two Sacrifices are essentially identical,[14] and the Mass derives its entire virtue from the Sacrifice of the Cross. The infinite value of the latter can be neither increased nor diminished. The Sacrifice of the Cross, to employ a metaphor, filled the infinite reservoirs to overflowing with healing waters, from which the Mass merely draws for the purpose of distributing copious draughts to the faithful. The Protestant view of the Mass as " a denial of the one Sacrifice of Christ " is wrong; for the Mass does, and can do, no more than convey the merits of Christ to mankind by means of a sacrifice *(applicatio per modum sacrificii'),* and hence is no independent sacrifice superadded to that of the Cross, whereby the latter would be completed or enhanced in value.

The possibility as well as the justification and relative

12 Heb. X, 26 sq.: *"Voluntarie enim peccantibus nubis post acceptam notitiam veritatis iam non relinquitur pro peccatis hostia, terribilis autem quaedam exspectatio iudicii."* — Cfr. Pohle-Preuss, *Soteriology,* PP· 1'9 «*«·

13 Sess. XXII, can. 4: *"Si quis dixerit, blasphcmiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio i>i cruce peracto per Missae sacrificium aut illi per hoc derogari, anathema sit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 951).

1* *V. infra.* No. a.

necessity of the Mass is based on the important distinction between objective and subjective redemption, between the sufficiency and efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Cross.[16]

2. The Essential Identity of the Mass with the Sacrifice of the Cross.—The Mass is essentially identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross, because the sacrificial gift and the sacrificing priest arc the same in both, and the only difference between them is in the different manner of offering—this being bloody in the one, unbloody in the other.

a) The Church teaches through the Council of Trent that the Mass is, of its very nature, a " representation," a " commemoration," and an " application " of the Sacrifice of the Cross.[18] The Roman Catechism adds a fourth characteristic, *viz.:* repetition.[17] Hence the Mass is

(1) A representation of the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, not after the fashion of a historic tragedy, or a passion-play, but as a sacrificial appearance of Christ on the altar under the separate species of bread and wine.

(2) The Mass is a "commemoration" *(memoria)* of Christ's death on the Cross, held in accordance with His own command: " Do this as a commemoration of me."

(3) The Mass is an "application " *(applicatio)* to the faithful of the redemptive merits of Christ.

(4) The Mass is a "renewal " *(instauratio)* or repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross. This is not an article of faith, but a truth inculcated by the Roman Catechism:

16 On the difference between *cuficicntia* and *efKcacilae (applicatio)* see Pohle-Preuss, *Soteriology,* pp. 81 sqq.

18 *Cone. Trid.,* Ses* XXII, csp. r.

IT *Cat. Rom.,* P. II, c. 4, qu. 68.

"He [Christ] bequeathed to us a visible Sacrifice, by which that bloody Sacrifice, soon after to be offered once on the Cross, would be renewed. . . . For the bloody and unbloody victim arc not two victims, but one only, whose sacrifice . . . is daily renewed in the Eucharist." 18 However, this repetition is not to be understood as a multiplication, but simply as an application of the merits of the Passion.

b) The relation between the two sacrifices is one of essential identity because Priest and Victim arc the same in both, the only difference being in the manner of offering. This is of faith. For the Tridentine Council says: . the Victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner alone of offering being different."18 Is this identity of the two victims numerical or merely specific? As Christ Himself is the sacrificing Priest *(offerens)* and the sacrificial Victim *(hostia)* in both sacrifices, there is plainly a numerical identity. In regard to the manner of offering *(offerendi ratio),* on the other hand, it is naturally a question only of a specific identity or unity, that includes the possibility of two, ten, a hundred, a thousand masses.20

3. How the Two Sacrifices Differ.—The main difference between the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Mass lies, as we have seen, in the manner

is L. *c.: "Nobis visibile sacrificium reliquit, quo cruentum illud semel in cruce paulo post immolandum instaurerclur."— Ibid.,* qu. 74: *"Neque enim cruenta ei incruenta hostia duae sunt hostiae, sed una tantum, cuius sacrificium . . .* in *Eucharistia quotidie instau-*

10 Sees. XXII, cap. 2: *"Uno enim eademque est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui scipsum tunc* in *cruce obtulit, sold offerendi ratione diversa."*

20 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia.* o<sp. 76. aect. i, n. 4 sqq.

of offering. But there are other differences, though of minor importance.

a) In the first place, the Sacrifice of the Cross was an absolute, while the Mass is a relative sacrifice.'[1]

Another difference is that the Sacrifice of the Cross was offered but once, whereas the Mass is repeated indefinitely until the coming of the Lord.[22]

A third difference lies in this, that the Sacrifice of the Cross completed the redemption of the human race, while the Mass conveys the fruits of that Sacrifice to the faithful.

A fourth difference is that on the Cross Christ was the sole Priest, whereas in the Mass He employs human ministers, Himself merely acting as *Sacerdos principalis.*

The manner of offering entails a fifth difference, *viz.:* on the Cross Christ offered Himself *in specie propria,* while in the Mass He offers Himself *in specie aliena,* under the appearances of bread and wine.

From this follows a sixth difference, *vis.:* that whereas on the Cross our Lord was immolated as a passible and mortal man, in the Mass He offers Himself in the immortal state of glorification.

b) Regarding the relation between the Mass and the Last Supper, we may add that both sacrifices are identical in object and subject (Christ) as well as in the manner of offering. It is perfectly correct, therefore, to say that the Last Supper was the first Mass, though there are a few non-essential distinctions between the two. (i) The Last Supper, like the Mass, was a relative sacrifice, but it was by its very nature an anticipatory commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross, whereas the

21 The Mass may be called an absolute sacrifice only in the sense that it is a real and true sacrifice,

22 *Clr.* 1 Cor. XI, afi.

Mass is retrospective. (2) At the Last Supper Christ celebrated in His own person, whereas in the Mass He is represented by the priest. (3) Regarded in its origin, the Last Supper appears as the institution, and consequently as the pattern exemplar, of the Mass, which on its part only imitates what Christ has done and commanded His Church to repeat.

ARTICLE 2

THE CONSECRATION AS THE REAL SACRIFICIAL ACT

Formerly theologians were very much at variance as to whether the sacrifice is accomplished in the Offertory, in the Consecration, or in the Communion. As these are the three chief parts of the Mass, one of them must contain the sacrificial act. It is now safe to say that the sacrificial act is comprised in the Consecration.

i. The Sacrifice not Completed in the Offertory.—Some theologians have sought for the sacrificial act in the Offertory because this part of the Mass is made up of prayers composed in the true language of sacrifice, *e. g.:* "Receive, O Holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God, this spotless Host," and: "We offer up to Thee, O Lord, the Chalice of salvation, . . 1 etc.

From the wording of these prayers it is clear that bread and wine constitute the secondary sacrificial elements of

1-SuiCipr, *eancte Pater, omnipotem aeterne Dem, liane tinmaculatam hostiam. . . " O/· ferimm lib,, Domine, calicem ealutarir. . .*

the Mass and arc offered up to God for the purpose of the ensuing Consecration. Hence bread and wine belong to the sacrifice, not as *res oblata,* but merely as *terminus a quo* of the *res oblata,* inasmuch as they are destined to cease to exist by being changed into the sacrificial Victim, Jesus Christ. The Eucharistic elements can not be the primary matter of sacrifice, since the Mass is not, like the figurative *minchah* of Melchiscdech, a mere offering of bread and wine, but of the Body and Blood of Christ. " If anyone saith," declares the Council of Trent, "that . . . Christ did not . . . ordain that [the Apostles] and other priests should offer His own Body and Blood, let him be anathema."[2]

Consequently, the sacrifice is not in the Offertory. Nor can it be in any other part of the Mass preceding the Consecration, because the Body and Blood of Christ are not present upon the altar until after the Consecration. Those theologians who, like Johann Eck, thought that the sacrificial act was comprised in the prayer *" Unde et memores,"* which is recited after the Consecration, overlooked the fact that the sacrificial victim is present on the altar immediately after the Consecration, and that, consequently, in the Roman Liturgy, in which that prayer occurs, the sacrifice is already consummated when the prayer is said. The same is true of the Epiklesis in the Greek rite.[3] Moreover, the Scriptural account of the Last Supper, which must of necessity contain everything that is essential to the sacrifice, makes no mention of the aforesaid prayer or of the Epiklesis.

The same arguments militate against the view of Mel-

2 Sess. XXII, can. 2: *"Si quit dixerit, . . . Christum non ordinasse, ut ipsi [Apostoli] allique sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suunt, anathema sit."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart. n. 949).

3 K. *supra.* Part II, Ch. I, Sect. i. Art 3.

chior Cano, according to which the sacrificial act is comprised in the breaking of the Host or in the mixture of the Body and Blood shortly before the "Agnus Dei." For in both cases the mystic slaying of the Victim, in which the sacrifice undoubtedly consists, is already over. It may be noted in this connection that the Liturgy of St. Basil omits the double ceremony referred to. Though the Eucharistic Sacrifice can rightly be called *fractio panis,* the breaking of the bread in itself does not affect the sacrificial Body of Christ, but merely the external species, which can in no sense of the word be regarded either as the Victim or as a part of the Victim, but merely serves the purpose of rendering visible the invisible Body of our Lord, and thereby makes possible its offering upon the altar. Cano's theory, furthermore, cannot be applied to the Chalice, the contents of which are divided only at the Communion.

Yet, the ceremony of the breaking of the Host *(fractio hostiae')* has a profound symbolic meaning. It liturgically represents the violent death of Christ and prepares the Body broken, *i. e.* offered for us, so that it may be a true sacrificial food.

The *mixture,* in which part of the consecrated bread is dipped into the consecrated wine, is a very old and widespread custom symbolizing the unity and inseparability of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the reunion of the Precious Blood with the Sacred Body of Christ at the Resurrection. To omit this rite would not render the Mass invalid.[4]

2. The Sacrifice not Comprised in the Communion of the Priest.—The position of

4 On the *fraclion* and the mixture cfr. Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,* pp. 364 sqq. *Mass, Pl›. 70.;* sqq.; Fortescue, *The*

the Communion in the Mass may be briefly described as a participation and completion of the sacrifice. The essence of the Mass does not consist in the Communion for the simple reason that the Body and Blood of Christ cannot be consumed until the sacrifice proper is completed.

a) Nevertheless there have been some eminent theologians *(e. g.* Ledesma and Dominicus Soto) who held that the sacrifice consists in the Communion of the priest, as being the destruction of the Victim, to which the Consecration forms merely a condition and prelude.

Soto says: " The death of Christ is not represented in the Consecration. The Consecration takes place in order that He may be immolated whilst He is consumed; for this is a picture of the death and burial of Christ. And in the consumption of the Blood we have an image of its effusion."[6] But this theory can hardly be reconciled with the following declaration of the Tridentine Council: " If anyone saith that ... to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat, let him be anathema."[e]

Equally untenable is the view defended by Bellarmine,[7] De Lugo,[8] and Tournely,[0] that Communion, as a kind of destruction, is at least a co-essential factor in the constitution of the Mass. If this were the case, then the Last

B *Comment,* in *Sent.,* IV. dist. 13, qu. 2, art. 1: *"Mors Christi non repraesentatur in consecratione; imo consecratur, ut immoletur, dum consumitur; nam illa est mortis et sepulturae Christi effigies. Et in sumptione sanguinis adhibetur imago effusionis eius."*

u Scse. XXII, can. 1: *"Si quis dixerit, . . . quod offerri non sil aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, anathema sit."*

7 *De Eucharistia.* IV, *ap.*

8 *De Eucharistia,* disp. 19. sect. $ sq.

0 *De Eucharistia,* qu. 8. art. *a,* conci. 4.

Supper would have been a true sacrifice only on condition that Christ had given Communion to Himself as well as to His Apostles. For this, however probable it may appear, we have absolutely no evidence. Moreover, the celebrant docs not receive Communion as the representative of Christ, but in his own person and for his own personal benefit.

Nevertheless, the consumption of the Host and of the contents of the Chalice, though a kind of destruction, does not satisfy the demand of these theologians because the sacrificial transformation of the victim must take place on the altar, and not in the body of the celebrant, whilst the partaking of the two elements can at most represent the burial, but not the sacrificial death of Christ.[10]

b) We have shown that the Communion of the priest does not belong to the essence of the sacrifice. It does belong, however, to its integrity.

a) The Communion of the priest marks the completion of the sacrifice. It is a strict ecclesiastical precept,[11] embodied in the rubrics of the Roman Liturgy, that in case the Mass is interrupted by sudden illness on the part of the celebrant, some other priest, even though not fasting, shall, if possible, "complete" the Holy Sacrifice by consuming the species.

β) There can be no perfect sacrifice of the unbloody kind without a sacrificial banquet. Consequently, the Communion of the priest belongs to the integrity of the Mass.[12]

10 For a fuller discussion of thia theory see Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis,* Vol. I. 4th cd., pp. 558 sqq., Rome 1907.

11 Cfr. *Decret. Grat., De Conseer.,* dist. 2, c. 11.

12 Cfr. St. Thomas, Siinima *Theol.,* 3a, qu. 82, art. 4.

γ) If the Communion of the priest does not belong to the essence of the Mass, much less does that of the faithful. Therefore so-called "private Masses," at which the priest alone communicates, are not only valid but lawful, as the Tridentine Council has expressly defined.[13] The contention of the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia, that "participation in the sacrifice is essential to the sacrifice," and that consequently no private Mass is valid unless the attending faithful make at least a "spiritual communion," was condemned as false and savoring of heresy by Pius VI.[14]

3. The Double Consecration as the Physical Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass.—After eliminating the Offertory and Communion, there remains the Consecration as that part of the Mass in which the true sacrificial character must be sought.

a) The Mass has three chief constituent parts: the Offertory, the Consecration, and the Communion. If, as we have demonstrated, the sacrifice is not in the Offertory, nor in the Communion, it must necessarily be in the Consecration.

In matter of fact, that part of the Mass alone can be regarded as the proper sacrificial act, which is such by Christ's own institution. Now our Lord's words: "This is my Body, this is my Blood," are embodied in the Consecration.[15]

13 Sess. XXII. can. 8: *"Si quis dixerit, Missas, in quibus solus sacerdos sacramcnialiter communicat, illicites esse ideoque abrogandas, anathema sit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 9SS>·

14 In the dogmatic Bull *"Auctorem Fidei,* A. D. 1794- (Denzinger Bannwart, n. t$a8).

Moreover, from the dogmatic teaching of Trent[16] that no one but a priest can validly say Mass, it follows that the sacrifice must be contained in some act which the priest alone can perform. This is the Consecration. Consequently, the power of consecrating is identical with the power of offering the Holy Sacrifice. This clearly appears from the Roman Liturgy. In ordaining a candidate to the priesthood, the bishop bestows on him the "*potestas offerendi sacrificium,*" without mentioning the "'*potestas consecrandi.*" Hence the two faculties must be identical.

The same conclusion can be deduced from the dogmatic teaching of the Church [17] that Christ is the "*sacerdos principalis*" of the Mass and the human minister merely plays a secondary rôle. It follows that the sacrifice must occur in that particular portion of the Liturgy in which the priest assumes the personal part of Christ. This he does at the Consecration, when he utters the words: "This is my Body, this is my Blood." [18]

The teaching here espoused is strongly favored by the Fathers[19] and the great majority of the Schoolmen. St. Thomas says: "The sacrifice of this Sacrament is offered [to God] by the Consecration." [20]

b) "While the Consecration as such can be shown with certainty to be the act of sacrifice, the necessity of a *twofold* Consecration can be demonstrated only as highly probable.

a) Christ said at the Last Supper, after consecrating both bread and wine: "Do this for a commemoration

16 Sess. XXII, can. *x.*

17 Cfr. *supra,* Art. i, No. 2.

18 Cfr. St. Thomas, Summo *Theol.,* 30, qu. 8s, art 1.

19 See Vasquez, *Comment. in S. Theol.,* III, disp. 212, sect. 1.

n-en.i [Deo] saerLum^eZ^.

of me." It is extremely probable that this mandate referred to the validity, and not merely to the licitness, of the sacrificial action.

Moreover, the Mass, as a relative sacrifice, is essentially a representation of the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross. Since it was no mere death from suffocation that Jesus suffered, but a bloody death, in which His veins were emptied of their blood, this condition of separation must receive visible representation on the altar. This condition is fulfilled only by the double Consecration, which brings before our eyes the Body and Blood in the state of separation and thus represents the mystical shedding of the Blood. It is this consideration that suggested to the Fathers the idea, which was adopted into some liturgies, of the double Consecration as a two-edged "mystical sword." Thus St. Gregory of Nazianzus says: " Hesitate not to pray for me, . . . when with bloodless stroke thou separatest the Body and Blood of the Lord, having speech as a sword."[21]

/3) Henriquez, Bosco, Frassen, Henno, and other theologians, mostly of the Scotist persuasion, as well as a few modern authors (Rohling,[22] Schouppe, Stentrup, and Fr. Schmid[23]) hold that when one of the consecrated elements is invalid, the consecration of the valid element not only produces the Sacrament, but also the (mutilated) sacrifice. St. Alphonsus 2[24] regards this opinion as probable, but inclines to the one we have adopted as *communior et probabilior."* To-day, because of the weight of the arguments brought in its favor, and the authority of its defenders, our theory may safely be regarded as *"pro-*

21 *Ep.,* 171 [240J *ad riinphil.* (Migne, *P. G.*. XXXVII, 282).

22 A. Rohling. *Miscell. Eucharistica,* in the Mayence *Katholik.* 1868, II, pp. 257 s<jq·

23 In the Innsbruck *Zeitschrift für kath. Théologie,* 1892, pp. 97 sqq.

24 *Theol. Moral.,* tr. jt, c. 2. art. 2, qu. ».

babilissiwa" Its opponents base their reasoning chiefly on the contention that the Sacrament in the Eucharist is inseparable in idea from the Sacrifice. If the Consecration of one element alone is valid, they say, we have the Sacrament, and consequently also the Sacrifice, though the celebrant is no doubt strictly bound by the law of double Consecration, from which not even the Pope may dispense. They quote St. Cyprian 25 as accusing certain priests, who for fear of persecution omitted to consecrate the chalice, not of invalidating or mutilating the sacrifice, but merely of " ignorance and simplemindedness." They add that it would be difficult to understand why the entire Eucharistic celebration was originally called *''fractio panis"* if the conversion of the bread alone did not essentially constitute the Sacrifice of the Mass. Needless to say, these arguments do not shake our thesis.

25£/>., 63, n. 17.

SECTION 2

THE METAPHYSICAL ESSENCE OF THE MASS

The physical essence of the Mass, as we have seen, is comprised in the double Consecration of the bread and wine. There remains the more difficult metaphysical question, whether and in what degree the scientific concept of sacrifice is realized in this double Consecration. In order that it be realized, the three essential momenta of a sacrifice, *viz.:* the sacrificial gift, the sacrificing minister, and the sacrificial object,[1] must be present in the double Consecration.

It is easy to demonstrate the first-mentioned two points. Christ Himself appears in the double Consecration both as victim *{hostia, victima')* and as priest *{sacerdos principalis).* The object, *i. e.* the fourfold purpose of adoration, thanksgiving, petition, and propitiation, is also clearly attained.[2]

Therefore the problem is finally seen to lie entirely in the determination of the fourth essential, *viz.:* the real sacrificial act *{actio sacrifica),* and indeed (i) not so much in the physical form of this act, *i. e.* the external oblation, as (2) in the proximate matter, *i. e.* the transformation of the

1 *V. supra,* Ch. I, Sect, i, Art. I. 2 K *infra.* Ch. HI, Sect r.

sacrificial gift, since the glorified Victim, being impassible, cannot be really transformed, much less destroyed.

ARTICLE i

SOME UNSATISFACTORY THEORIES REGARDING THE METAPHYSICAL ESSENCE OF THE MASS

I. The Theory of Vasquez.—The famous Spanish theologian Father Gabriel Vasquez, S. J., correctly distinguishes between absolute and relative sacrifice, but holds that a true destruction of the victim, *i. e.* a real slaying of Christ, is necessary only for the absolute Sacrifice of the Cross. For the Mass, as a purely relative sacrifice, he deems it sufficient that the physical slaying of Christ be visibly represented in the separation of His Body and Blood on the altar. In other words, to make the Mass a true sacrifice it suffices, (i) that its victim was really slain or destroyed at some previous time, and (2) that this past event be here and now visibly represented by way of commemoration.[1]

According to this theory the twofold Consecration does not signify any real or equivalent (which actually means

[1] Vasquez, Comment, in 5. *Theol.*, HI, disp. 220, c. 3: "Commemo·*rativum* [i. e. relativum] *sacrificium jine rei oblatae immutatione [«. c. destructions! esse potest, tametsi ad essentiam sacrificii absoluti necessaria sit, eo quod ratio formalis sacrificii* — quae *est significatio non in verbis, sed in rebus, qu& denotatur Deus auctor vitae et mortis— sine tali immutatione in sacrificio commemorahvo referitur."*

not quite equivalent) physical or moral, transformation of the Divine Victim, but merely a reproduction and representation as it were of the slaying of our Lord on the Cross by means of the separate presence of His Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine.[2]

This view was adopted by the brothers De Walenburch, by Becanus, and other older theologians. Of modern authors Perrone[3] prefers it for the reason that it most effectively refutes the Protestant objections against the Mass, since no orthodox Protestant will refuse to believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist or deny that the Mass is a representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Critical Appreciation of This Theory.—Vasquez' theory has the indisputable merit of emphasizing the intrinsic and essential relation existing between the Mass and the Sacrifice of the Cross,—a relation without which the Mass would be impossible.·* But the learned Jesuit does not sufficiently emphasize the character of the Mass as an *absolute* sacrifice.

It is of faith that the Mass is "a true and proper sacrifice," [5] and not "a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice consummated on the Cross."[e] Hence the Mass is both an absolute and a relative sacrifice, and must include within itself (or, more precisely, within the double Consecration which forms its physical essence) all the essential elements of both. The essential constituents of

2 Cfr. Vasquez. *Op. tit.,* disp. *323,* sect. 7 son·

3 De Eucharistia, P. II, n. as°.

‹ *V. supra.* Sect. I, Art. 1.

6 *Cone. Trident.,* Ses». XXXI, can. ’.

a Cone. Trident., Sess. XXII, can. J.

an absolute sacrifice are: the external oblation as the form, and the slaying of the sacrificial victim as the proximate matter. Vasquez, in defining the Mass as merely a living dramatic representation of the slaying of Christ on the Cross, without a simultaneous transformation of the Victim on the altar, appears to reduce the Mass to a purely relative sacrifice, thereby endangering the dogma that it is "a true and proper sacrifice."

Nevertheless, Cardinals De Lugo and Cienfucgos went decidedly too far when they maintained that the Tridentine definition indirectly stamps Vasquez's theory as heretical. The Spanish Jesuit never dreamt of denying cither the reality of the Mass or its character of a true and proper sacrifice; nor did he intend to reduce it to a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross. What he meant was that the Mass becomes a true sacrifice in itself precisely by the fact that it is a representation and reproduction of the Sacrifice of the Cross. The idea of reducing the Holy Sacrifice to a sort of passion play was far from his mind, for he insists time and again on the actual presence upon the Eucharistic altar of the true sacrificial Body and Blood of Christ.

It may, however, be justly argued against Vasquez' position that if the Mass is to be something more than a mere passion play, it is not sufficient that Christ appear in His real personality on the altar, but He must also be in some manner really sacrificed there. Cardinal De Lugo illustrates this contention as follows: Were Jephta to rise again from the grave with his daughter, and present before our eyes a living dramatic representation of her slaying, after the fashion of a tragedy, we should not see before us a true sacrifice, because there would be lacking that sacrificial act of transformation or destruction of the victim which Vasquez himself acknowl-

edges to be an essential constituent of every sacrifice.[7]

2. The Theory of Suarez.—According to Francis Suarez, S. J.,[8] every true sacrifice involves "a real transformation of the sacrificial matter." However, this process need not necessarily be a change for the worse *(immutatio in deterius, i. e. destructio)*, as in the Jewish holocaust; it may be a transformation into a higher and more precious form *(immutatio in melius),* as when incense is transformed into sweet fragrance.

Suarez neither ignores nor overlooks the fact that " the [double] Consecration as a mystic slaying and separation of the Body and Blood has a sacrificial character and truly transforms Christ by reducing Him to the condition of a victim *(status victimae)"*[9] However, he does not put the sacrificial action proper in the double Consecration, but secondarily in the destruction of the elements of bread and wine as the *terminus a quo,* and primarily in the substantial reproduction of the true Body and Blood of Christ as the *terminus ad quern* of the double Consecration, thereby identifying the offering proper with the production of the sacrificial Body and Blood.

This view was adopted by Arriaga, Casalius, and others. Dr. Scheeben,[10] who also defends it, claims that

1 De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp, ig. sect. 4, n. 58.—Vasquez's theory is defended by Father Jos. Rickaby. S. J. *(The Lord My Light,* pp. 142 sqq.. London 1915)·

s *De Eucharistia,* disp. 7S. sect 5 »q·

0 Op. *cit.,* sect 6, n. 6 sqq.

to Die Mysterien des Christenturns. 3rd ed.. § *73.* Freiburg 191a; *Dogmatik,* Vol. III. 5 270 Freiburg 1882; cfr. Scanned Wilhelm, *A Msnual of Catholic Theology,* Vol. II, and ed., London 1901.

the idea of destruction originated in the sixteenth century and was unknown to the older Schoolmen. In this, however, he is mistaken, as may be seen from a passage in the second part of the *Summa* of St. Thomas.[11]

Critical Appreciation of This Theory.— The theory of Suarez is based upon an exalted conception of the Mass indeed, but errs in identifying the substantial production of the Eucharistic Victim with the sacrificing of the same.

There is a good deal of truth in the idea that the Eucharistic elements are destined by their destruction to be transformed into something higher and more precious. The destruction of the victim in any sacrifice is never an end in itself, but merely a means to an end, *i. e.* the way to sanctification and union with God. But the elements of the Eucharist are not the victim, and to say that the Eucharistic sacrifice, in its last analysis, is identical with the substantial reproduction of Christ under the twofold species of bread and wine, reveals a serious weakness.[12] For the production of a thing can never be identical with its sacrifice. With the idea of sacrifice is intimately linked in the minds of all men the notion of kenosis or self-abasement. To offer something as a sacrifice always means to divest oneself of it, even though this self-abasement may finally lead to exaltation. The idea of kenosis is entirely wanting in the *immutatio perfective* of Suarez.

11 Summa *Theol.,* 2a aae, qu. 86, art. 1: *"Si aliquid exhibeatur In cultum divinum, quasi in aliquod sacrum quod inde fieri debeat, consumendum, et oblatio est et sacrificium Deo generando filios Vcl applicando alias causas naturales ad s.m.les procreationes vel productiones efficiendas."*

12 This was already perceived by De Lugo, who says (De *Eucharistia,* disp. 19, sect. 4, n. 5a): *"Est contra communem omnium concipiendi et loquendi modum dicere, rem aliquam quando producitur, sacrificari potuisseque offerri sacri-*

3. The Theory of Cardinal Cienfuégos.— Cardinal Cienfuégos, who was a member of the famous college of the Salmanticenses,[13] in his book *Vita Abscondita sub Speciebus Velata,*[14] argues that the Mass can be held to be a true, *i. e.* an absolute sacrifice only on condition that it involves a sacrificial destruction of the Eucharistic Christ. This sacrificial destruction he would find in the voluntary suspension of the faculties of the senses, especially sight and hearing. This suspension of the lower life, implied by the sacramental mode of existence, lasts from the Consecration to the mixture of the sacred species shortly before the " Agnus Dei," at which juncture Christ, by a miracle, is supposed to resume the natural use of His senses.

Critical Appreciation of This Theory.— Because of its strangeness and indemonstrability, this theory[15] has nowhere found acceptance. It is intrinsically improbable because it rests upon purely speculative assumptions. Even if the glorified Body of Christ in the Eucharist were hindered in the natural exercise of its external senses by the spiritual mode of its existence, it would be no more than a " pious opinion " to assume that its faculties are resumed by a miracle. The hypothesis that Christ, by a third miracle, voluntarily surrenders His sensitive functions for a certain time, for the purpose of performing a sacrificial act, is gratuitous. Moreover, Cardinal Cienfuégos exaggerates the absolute element of the Consecration to such a degree that he loses sight almost entirely of the specific identity of the Mass with the Sacrifice of the Cross and of the relativity of the former to the latter.

13 On the Salmanticenses see the *Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. XIII.

14 Published at Rome in 1728.

15 Developed in ΠΛ1 *Abicondita tub Spectebus h'clata,* disp. $, stcl· a sqq.

4. The Theory of Thalhofer.—Dr. Valentine Thalhofer,[10] an eminent German theologian of the nineteenth century,[17] asserts the existence of a true "heavenly sacrifice" of Christ, which he describes as a living representation and virtual continuation of the Sacrifice of the Cross by virtue of the intrinsic sacrificial act embodied in the latter. This act is retained by the will of the transfigured God-man, constantly reproduced, and externally discernible in the glorified wounds of His sacred Body. It is only in this way, says Thalhofer, that Christ is, and for ever remains, "an eternal priest according to the order of Melchisedech."

According to this view the Mass is linked immediately and intimately, not with the Sacrifice of the Cross, but with Christ's "heavenly sacrifice," which becomes a temporal and spatial phenomenon on the Eucharistic altar.

Thalhofer explains the metaphysical essence of the Mass as follows: "In the Consecration the heavenly High Priest, and together with Him the heavenly Victim, descends into time and space and thereby into the mundane order of the before and after. While becoming present in *forma sacrificii* on the altar by means of the words of transformation in the form of separation, Christ performs upon the altar, that is to say in time and space, essentially the same sacrificial act which He once

10 See a sketch of his life and writings in the *Catholic Encyclopc-*

17 He was fn11«w»,t tions by Simar, *Dogmatilt* Vol' II t<b ''*·· »· Fr.ltarg ,8S9:

performed upon the Cross, and which He still performs as a heavenly sacrifice in the other world. We have the same sacrificing priest as on the Cross, the same sacrificial object, namely His sacred Humanity consisting of Soul and Body, the same internal sacrificial act, really performed and relatively reproduced. . . . And in order to assure the faithful, and to represent to their senses essentially the same event that takes place in the Consecration as that which occurred when the Saviour shed His Blood, He becomes present in the Consecration not merely under the species of bread, but in the form of separate species. The mystical separation of Flesh and Blood in the act of Consecration is the external form of the invisible sacrificial act, identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross, which Christ performs upon the altar during the Consecration." "

According to Thalhofer, therefore, Christ's sacrificial act in the Mass continues after the Consecration until the Communion. " From that time on," Simar adds, " the consecrated species (including those destined to be reserved) possess exclusively the character of the Sacrament, or of the Eucharistic banquet."

Critical Appreciation of This Theory.—Thalhofer's theory is profound, but it lacks logical development. One of its strong points is the emphasis it places upon the perpetual continuation of Christ's spirit of sacrifice. By showing that the *forma sacrificii* is contained in the separation of the Body and the Blood in the Mass as well as in the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, Thalhofer helps us to understand how the Mass can and must

18 Thalhofer, *Das Offer des Allen «nd iVcncn Blindes, } ji,* Ralisbon 1870; cfr. Rauschcn. *Enchanst and Penance,* pp. 65

be a relative sacrifice. But there are other points that challenge criticism.

Thalhofer teaches that the Mass is based upon a supposed heavenly sacrifice of Christ, which is the virtual continuation of the Sacrifice of the Cross and becomes a temporal and spatial phenomenon in the Mass. He contends that these three different sacrifices are held together by the one sacrificial act of Christ, as by a common bond. But is there really such a "heavenly sacrifice"? Its existence is extremely doubtful, to say the least. The internal sacrificial act of Christ in itself is not a true sacrifice, nor can it become such by virtue of the sacred wounds of our Saviour, because the sacrificial action is wanting. Hence nearly all theologians regard this "heavenly sacrifice" as a fond dream.[10]

Another objection to Thalhofer's theory is that it exaggerates the identity of the Mass with the Sacrifice of the Cross and reduces the real distinctions between the two, which are based upon the different manner of offering and emphasized by the Council of Trent, to mere externalities.

Finally, Thalhofer, who was an advocate of the destruction theory, fails to show wherein the absolute sacrificial element of the Mass (or the double Consecration) consists.[20]

in On Thalhofer's hypothetical "heavenly sacrifice" see Pohle-Preuss. Selenology, pp. 137 sq.

eion of this theory see Sasse. *De Sacranienlis,* Vol. 1, thes. 31, Freiburg >897.

ARTICLE 2

ACCEPTABLE THEORIES REGARDING THE METAPHYSICAL ESSENCE OF THE MASS

In trying to form a plausible theory regarding the metaphysical essence of the Mass, it is necessary to keep in mind the following truths:

(1) The double Consecration must establish and explain the fact that the Mass is both an absolute and a relative sacrifice.

(2) The sacrificial action veiled in the double Consecration must somehow refer to the Eucharistic Christ Himself, not to the elements of bread and wine.

(3) The sacrificial act must culminate, not in the glorification of Christ, but in a kenosis, *i. e.* a real self-abasement.

(4) If this kenosis be conceived as a slaying, it cannot be real but only sacramental or mystical, because Christ is now immortal and impassible. The term "mystical" is used in reference to the mystery in which the shedding of Christ's Blood takes place; it is opposed to "real" and equivalent to "representative, commemorative, or relative."[1]

(5) The *momenta* which approximate in any degree the mystical slaying to a real exinanition, must not be rejected but intelligently appraised.

i. The Theory of Cardinal Billot.—Struck by the observation that the pre-Tridentine theologians regarded with disfavor the idea that the Mass requires a real destruction of the victim,

1 Willielin-Scannel), *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* and cd.. Vol. II, p. 456. London 1901.

Cardinal Billot[2] refers the absolute element of sacrifice to the (active) sacramental slaying, and the relative element to the (passive) separation of the Body and Blood.

Both are effected by the double Consecration, which is therefore truly a " two-edged sword," the cause from which the double character of the Mass as an absolute and as a relative sacrifice proceeds. Since the " mystical slaying"-of the victim involves the Eucharistic Christ Himself, and takes the form of a symbolic destruction, we have all the conditions necessary to render this view acceptable.

Critical Appreciation of This Theory.— Cardinal Billot's theory, which was accepted by Gihr and Atzberger, duly emphasizes the relative element of sacrifice in the Mass, but it is unsatisfactory as regards the absolute element, which it refers to the sacramental slaying *(mactatio mystica)* of Christ.

The Mass has this peculiarity, which it shares with no other sacrifice, that it involves no real slaying of the victim and no real shedding of blood, but a destruction that is purely " mystical." Now the sacramental separation of the Blood of Christ from Ilis Body is a mystical destruction, because " by it Christ is made present under the sacramental species *in quodam externo habitu mortis et destructionis,* in so far as under the breakable species of bread there is visibly present, *vi sacramenti,* only the Body of Christ, and under the fluid form of the wine

2 *De Sacramentie.* Vol. I, 4th ed., pp. 567 sqq., Rome 1907.

only the Blood of Christ, so that in external appearance Christ appears before our eyes, so to speak, as a slain lamb."[3]

But how can this purely mystical slaying constitute a *real* sacrifice?

This question is synonymous with another, *viz.:* Was the purely mystical "surrender of the Body" and the purely mystical "shedding of the Blood" by our Divine Lord at the Last Supper a true sacrifice, or can it be called a sacrifice only in the figurative sense of the term?

Surely the rite which Christ Himself instituted as a true sacrifice for the remission of sins must be adequate for that purpose. It follows that the mystical slaying of the Victim suffices to constitute the essence of the Mass, all the more so since what is essential to the notion of sacrifice is the external oblation, not the destruction of the sacrificial matter.

For a better understanding of the subject we will add that, according to Billot's theory, Christ offers Himself in the Mass not *in specie propria,* but *in specie aliena,* that is to say, not in His physical being, but in the sacramental mode of existence, and "*for* this reason it is entirely sufficient for the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass, that our Lord appears under the sacramental veil in the state of destruction."[4] Moreover, a sacrifice, by its very definition, must be something visible. Now the invisible God-man appears before our eyes only under the unsubstantial appearances of the Sacrament. Hence His slaying in the Sacrifice of the Mass must be purely mystical, consummated by the sacramental separation of His Body and Blood.[5]

3 Cfr. Scheeben-Atzberger, *Dugmalih.* Vol. III. p. 6SS-

4 Scheeben-Atzberger, op. *cit.,* p. 656.

5 Cfr. Gihr. *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mais, pp. 91* tqq.

This theory of the double Consecration as a two-edged mystical sword, with which the Eucharistic Christ is slain and offered in a purely sacramental manner, is in conformity with the teaching of the Fathers and older Scholastics, and may therefore be called the traditional view. In matter of fact it was current up to the time of the Council of Trent. The post-Tridentine theology, in defending the Mass against the Protestant heretics, needlessly exaggerated the idea of destruction. The traditional conception is still proclaimed in Deharbe's and other popular catechisms."

2. The Theory of Lessius.—Father Lessius, S. J., in arguing against Suarez, insists that there must be a real destruction of the Victim in the Mass, because without this the Mass would not be an absolute sacrifice. In common with others he finds this destruction in the sacramental separation of the Body and Blood of Christ, as effected by the double Consecration, *i. e.* in the mystical slaying of our Lord. But he adds a new element when he teaches that the force of the double Consecration would result in an actual shedding of blood on the altar, if this were not *per accidens* rendered impossible by the impassibility of the transfigured Body of Christ.

This novel view has found many supporters, among others Dicastillo, C. Hurtado, Sylvius, Bossuet, Billuart,

6 On the *mactatio mystica* in the Mass, sec Fr. S. Rene, *Die Ceschichle des Messopfcrbegriffes* 2 vols., Freising 1901—3.

Gonet, Gotti, Berlage/ Oswald,7 Dieringer, Stôckl, Glossner, and Bautz.

Critical Appredation of This Theory.— Lessius is charged with exaggerating the force of the "two-edged sword" of the double Consecration and ascribing to it an effect which in the nature of things it cannot have.

He says: "It is no objection to the truth of this sacrifice that in it there does not actually occur a separation of the Blood from the Flesh, for this happens as it were *per accidens,* because of the concomitance of the parts. For by force of the words of Consecration there occurs a true separation, and the Body becomes present under the appearance of bread alone, and the Blood under the appearance of wine alone. And this is sufficient for the essence of this sacrifice, both to make it a true sacrifice (for the victim, thus made present, is transformed sufficiently to show that God has supreme power over all things) and to make it a commemorative [i. *e.* relative] sacrifice, representing to us the Sacrifice of the Cross and the death of the Lord."9 According to this theory, the intrinsic force of the words of Consecration would result in formally excluding the Blood from the Body,

7 *Dogmatik.* Vol. VII, pp. 416 sqq.

8 *Die dogmatische Lehre ton den hl. Sakramenten,* Vol. I, § 25, Munster 1894.

0 Lessius, *De Perfect. Moribusque Div.,* XII, 13, 97'· *"Nec obstat veritati huius sacrificii, quod non fiat reipsi separatio sanguinis a carne, quia id est quasi per accidens propter concomitantium partium. Nam quantum est e.r vi verborum, fit vera separatio et sub specie panis solum ponitur corpus, non sanguis, sub specie vini solus sanguis, non corpus. Et hoc sufficit ad rationem huius sacrificii, tum ut sit verum sacrificium (fit enim circa hostiam, dum sic ponitur, sufficiens mutatio, qua protestemur Deum habere supremam in omnia potestatem), tum ut sii sacrificium commemorativum [·. e. relativum} repraesentans nobis sacrificium crucis et mortem Domini."*

and the only reason why the Blood is not actually shed upon the altar, is that Christ is prevented from dying again by the miracle of the co-existence of all the parts of His glorified and impassible Body.

Against this explanation the opponents of Lessius object: Since *vi verborum* only the Body becomes really present without the Blood, and the Blood in turn without the Body, both Body and Blood appear as they really are. The Body, therefore, becomes present on the altar animated by the soul and filled with blood. Were it the tendency of the double Consecration formally to exclude the Blood from the Body, there would result an actual shedding of blood, or the words of Consecration would be false.[10]

In spite of some objections, however, we hail the theory of Lessius as a deepening and extension of the traditional idea of a mystical slaying, bringing it nearer to the notion of a real slaying, and thus strengthening the position of the Mass both as an absolute and as a relative sacrifice. Gutberlet rightly observes: "It were mere quibbling to try to disprove the idea of a mystically real separation by saying that the words of Consecration do not result in a separation of the Blood from the Body, and to contend that they have not this exclusive sense. . . . This is true to a certain extent,— if but one element were consecrated, especially if that one element were the bread, no separation would ensue. . . . But since the Blood is consecrated apart from the Body of Christ, the Blood must be conceived as existing without the Body, and the Body without the Blood; and as the words of Consecration are calculated, to effect this double representation, they are calculated to exclude the Body from

[10] Cfr. Franzclin, *De Eucharistia,* P. II, thes. 16; Tepe, *Inst. Theol*

the Blood and the Blood from the Body, in what other way, in fact, would it be possible to represent the bloody Sacrifice through the Consecration? Hence our opponents defeat themselves with their own weapons when they deny that the separation of the Blood from the Body is a result of the words of Consecration."[11]

Nor can it be reasonably objected against Lessius' theory that if a real effusion of the Blood is prevented by the impassibility of the glorified Body of Christ and the concomitance of the parts, there can be no true sacrifice. The mystically real slaying of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is just as capable of being a true sacrifice as the slaying of Isaac would have been if Abraham had dealt him a deadly stroke and God had not miraculously prevented the shedding of his blood and his death.

Lessius' theory, therefore, by no means lacks probability.

3. The Theory of Cardinal De Lugo.—With a view to emphasize the absolute character of the Mass, Cardinal De Lugo starts from the principle that every true sacrifice demands a real destruction of the sacrificial gift. This destruction may be either physical (as in the Sacrifice of the Cross) or moral (as in a drink-offering). The Mass is not only a relative (commemorative) sacrifice, but likewise an absolute sacrifice, and hence the Eucharistic Victim in the Consecration must be slain, either physically or morally. As Christ cannot be slain physically because of the state of His Body, the slaying must

11 Heinrich-Gutberlei, *Dogmat. Théologie,* Vol. IX. p. 86j.

moral. In matter of fact it consists in the voluntary reduction of His Body and Blood to the condition of food *(reductio ad statum cibi et potus},* in virtue of which the Eucharistic Saviour, humanly speaking, places Himself after the fashion of lifeless food at the mercy of mankind. This self-abasement or kenosis is comparable with that involved in the Incarnation, and in some respects even goes beyond it.12*

De Lugo's theory was adopted by Platel, Muniessa, Ulloa, Viva, Antoine, Holtzklau, Tamburini, and others of the older school. In modern times it was revived, after a long period of neglect, by Cardinal Franzelin, who in his profound treatise *De Eucharistia* has the following thesis: "We hold with Cardinal De Lugo and a great many later theologians, that the intrinsic form (essence) of the sacrificial act is in this: Christ . . . puts His Body and Blood, under the species of bread and wine, in a state of food and drink, by way of despoiling Himself of the functions connatural to His sacred Humanity." 18 Franzelin combines this theory of De Lugo

12 De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 19, sect. 5, n. 67: *"Licet [corpus Christi} consecratione non destruatur substantialiter, sed tamen destruitur* humano *modo, quatenus accipit statum decliviorem et talem, quo reddatur inutile ad usus Itumanos corporis* humani *et aptum ad alios diversos usus per modum cibi:* ▮ *. . quae mutatio sufficiens est ad verum sacrificium; fieri enim comestibile illud* quod *non erat comestibile et ita fieri comestibile ut iam non sit utile ad alios usus nisi per modum* cibi, maior mulafio est quam *aliae, quae ex communi hominum mente sufficiebant ad verum sacrificium."*

13 Cfr. Franzelin, *De Eucharistia,* P. II, thes. 16: *"Putamus cum Card. De Lugo plurimisque deinceps theologis, intrinsecam sacrificationis formam in eo esse quod Christus . . . corpus et sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis et vini constituit secundum quondam sanctissimae suae liunianilalis a /unctionibus et rationibus exislcndi connaturalibus exinanitionem ad statum cibi ac*

with the view of Cienfucgos, that the sacramental state of the Eucharistic Body is accompanied by a suspension of the functions of sense perception. In this form the theory has found numerous defenders, among whom we may mention Schouppe, De Augustinis, Hurter, Egger, Sasse, Einig, and Tepe, though recently opposition against it has been growing.

Critical Appreciation of This Theory.— Though Cardinal De Lugo's theory is open to various objections, it may nevertheless be utilized to develop, supplement, and deepen the traditional view.

a) De Lugo exaggerates the character of the Mass as an *absolute* sacrifice in much the same manner in which Vasquez exaggerates its character as a *relative* sacrifice. In fact, the intrinsic relation of the Mass to the Sacrifice of the Cross almost disappears in the theory under consideration. The reduction of Christ to the condition of food and drink reveals no analogy whatever to the shedding of His Blood on the Cross. The relation of the Mass to the Sacrifice of the Cross is purely extrinsic, something added from the outside rather than flowing from its inmost nature. Nor is the necessity of the double Consecration sufficiently evident, as a single Consecration would suffice to produce the condition of food and would, therefore, achieve the sacrifice. Two distinct Consecrations might, according to this theory, be required for the preparation of food and drink for a banquet *(ratione convivii),* but they are not necessary for the production of the Body and Blood in a state of separation *(ratione sacrificii),* as the exinanition obtains sufficiently in one Consecration.

b) These and other objections, however, can be removed if we combine the fundamental principle of De Hugo's theory with the traditional view, as developed by Billot, and with the notion of a real and mystical slaying of the Eucharistic Victim, as defended by Lessius.

Despite the fact that, objectively, the transfigured Humanity of Christ can suffer no diminution of its heavenly glory, the reduction of the transfigured God-man to the condition of food and drink, and the accompanying surrender of His sensitive functions, according to our way of thinking undeniably involves a real kenosis or self-abasement. By this consideration the Christian pulpit is placed in possession of a truly inexhaustible fund of lofty thoughts wherewith to illustrate the humility and love, the destitution and defenselessness of our Divine Saviour under the sacramental veil, His magnanimous submission to irreverence, dishonor, and sacrilege, and also the intrinsic relation of the Mass to the food-offering of Melchisedech and the *minchah* of Malachias, and, finally, to emphasize this exinanition as an unbloody and mystical continuation of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

The idea just developed is as familiar to Tradition as the notion of the mystic slaying of Christ in the Eucharist. Therefore the two should not be pitted against each other but combined, as was done by St. Cyril of Alexandria when he wrote: "He who was eaten in Egypt typically [i. *e.* in the manna], here offers Himself voluntarily[14] ... by placing Himself [before us] continuously as the Bread of Life."[15] St. Gregory of Nyssa[16] says that " the sacrificial Body would be inedible if it were alive,[17] wherefore the Body of Christ at the

κἶκονσίωι ἰαυτὸρ βυσιά{«<. ieOr. iN *Resurr., t* (Migne *P*
15 *βρώμα* fwijs αὐτό» *ιταραντίκα.* *C.,* XLVI, 611).
ἰαυτὸι- *TrapaOtptvos· Apud* Frame- 17 *ft„Îp ἴμψυγον fiu*
lin, *De Eucharûl..* P. II. thc». .6. *H VV'W·' ην·*

Communion of the Apostles — was already offered,"[18] *i. c.* transformed into the state of lifeless food.

c) Against this ancient Christian conception, which found expression also in the liturgies, it will not do to object, as Scheeben does, that Christ's sacramental mode of existence under the appearances of bread and wine involves an exaltation rather than an abasement, since His Body and Blood are present in the Eucharist in a pneumatic manner, after the fashion of pure spirits.[19] The fact alleged is true, but it proves nothing. In one sense the Eucharistic Christ is indeed exalted and glorified, but in another sense He is abased and humbled. In spite of His transfiguration in Heaven, Christ still retains in His Sacred Heart the same sacrificial love for us that He bore on the Cross. Is not the Hypostatic Union, the greatest of all miracles and the source of all our Saviour's glory, at the same time a true kenosis and self-abasement? Cfr. Phil. II, 7: "Christ emptied himself, taking the form of a servant."

d) But how are we to combine the fundamental idea of De Lugo's theory with the traditional teaching on the nature of sacrifice? Gutberlet answers this question succinctly as follows: "First and above all we uphold the idea of the mystical slaying of the sacrificial Victim by means of the double Consecration. In connection with this, the preparation of the food signifies the preparation of the slain lamb for the sacrificial feast. In this sense the preparation of the sacrificial food continues, supplements, and completes the mystic slaying. Only a lifeless lamb that has been sacrificed can be eaten, as St. Gregory of Nyssa says. Because the Eucharist is also a Sacrament, the Consecration, as an offering, reduces the Body of the Lord to the condition of food, which condition

18 *ήδη τό σώμα ίτίθυτο-* >a *V. lufra. pp.* i&s «qq.

is at the same time that of a sacrificial lamb."[20] Cfr. i Cor. V, 7: *"Etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus* — For Christ our pasch is sacrificed."

Readings: —*A. Tanner, *Cruentum Chrisli Sacrificium, Incruentum Missae Sacrificium Explicatum,* Prague 1669.—*V. Thalhofer, *Das Opfcr des Allen mid Neuen Blindes,* Ratisbon 1870.— Westernlayer, *Die Messe in ihrem Wesen oder das verklarte Kreusesopfcr,* Ratisbon 1868.— J. N. Diepolder, *Das IFesen des eucharistischen Opfers mid die vorsiiglichen kath. Thcologen der drei letsten Jahrhunderte,* Ratisbon 1877 —J. Schwane, *Die cucharislische Opferhandlung,* Freiburg 1889 —W. Humphrey, S. J., *The One Mediator, or Sacrifice and Sacraments,* London s. *a.*— J. M. A. Vacant, *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Église Latine,* Paris 1894.— J. van Wersch, *Das hl. Messopfcr in seiner IVesenhcit mid in seiner Feier,* Strassburg 1895.—A. Charre, *Le Sacrifice de l'Homme-Dieu,* Paris 1899.— W. Gotztnann, *Das eucharistische Opfer nach der Lehre der alteren Scholaslik,* Freiburg 1901.—A. G. Mortimer, *Eucharistic Sacrifice. An Historical and Theological Investigation of the Sacrificial Conception of the Holy Eucharist in the Catholic Church,* London 1901.—*Fr. S. Renz, *Die Geschichte des Messopferbegriffes oder der allé Glaube mid die neuen Theorien Uber das Wesen des unblutigen Opfers,* 2 vols., Freising 1901-1903.— G. Pell, *Jesu Opferhandlung in der hl. Eucharistie,* 2nd ed., Passau 1910.— Interesting articles by the Bishop of Victoria, B. C., and the Rev. M. J. Gallagher, of Grand Rapids, Mich., in the *Ecclesiastical Review,* 1900-1914.

20 Heinrich-Gutberlct, *Dogmatische Théologie,* Vol. IX, p. 868, Mayence 1901.

CHAPTER III

THE CAUSALITY OF THE MASS

A distinction must be made between the effects of the Mass and the manner in which these effects are produced.

The effects of the Mass consist in the attainment of the various ends for which the Sacrifice may be offered, *viz.:* adoration, thanksgiving, petition, and propitiation. Of these the first two refer to God, while the other two have reference to man. These effects are called the fruits of the Mass (*fructus Missae).*

As regards the manner in which the Mass produces its effects *{modus efficiendi),* this partly depends on the Sacrifice itself *{ex opere operato),* and partly on the personal devotion and piety of those who offer it with Christ *{ex opere operantis).*

SECTION i

THE EFFECTS OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

I. Various Heresies and the Teaching of the Church.—The Protestant Reformers, headed by Luther, recognized the Eucharist merely as a Sacrament and rejected the Mass entirely.

a) A Sacrament as such can profit only the recipient. It was from this point of view especially that the Reformers antagonized the Mass. They were willing to approve of it as a sacrifice of adoration and thanksgiving, though even in this sense they denatured the Catholic concept by declaring that it was a sacrifice in a figurative or symbolical sense only, *i. e.* a mere offering of prayers. The Protestant symbolic books insist that the Mass cannot be a true sacrifice because there is but one true sacrifice, *vis.:* that of the Cross.[1]

b) The Council of Trent emphasized the impetratory and propitiatory character of the Mass by defining: "If anyone saith that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving, . . . but not a propitiatory sacrifice, or that it profits him only who receives, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and

[1] *V. supra,* p. 336.

the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be anathema."[2]

In this canon we have a summary of all the sacrificial effects of the Mass.

(1) The Mass is a sacrifice of praise *(sacrificium latreuticum)*;

(2) It is a sacrifice of thanksgiving *(sacrificium eucharisticum)*;

(3) It is a sacrifice of propitiation *(sacrificium propitiatorium)*, referring to our sins *(peccata)* and to the temporal punishments which must be expiated by works of penance *(poenae)* or satisfaction *(satisfactiones)* in this life or in purgatory;

(4) It is a sacrifice of impétration *(sacrificium impetratorium)*, directed towards our spiritual concerns and needs *(aliae necessitates)*.

The Tridentine definition expressly says that, as a sacrifice of propitiation, the Mass can be offered also for the dead, *i. e.* the souls of the faithful departed in purgatory.

We have already shown that the Mass is a true sacrifice.[3] That it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is evident. Hence all that remains to be proved is that it is a sacrifice of impétration and propitiation.[4]

2. The Mass a True Sacrifice of Impétration and Propitiation.—Impétration *(impetratio)* and propitiation *(propitiatio)* are distin-

2 Sess. XXII, can. 3: *"Si quis dixerit, Missae sacrificium lanium esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, . . . non autem propitiatorium, vel soli prodesse sumenti neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, anathema sil."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 95**).

3 *V.* Ch. I. *supra.*

4 Cfr. Mal. I. 10 sqq. The traditional teaching on the subject is effectively developed by Th. Specht. *Die Wirkunfen des eucharisluchen Opfers,* pp. ty sqq.. Augsburg 1876.

guishable from each other. The former appeals to the goodness *(benignitas)* of God, the latter to His mercy *(misericordia).* Naturally, therefore, they differ also as regards their objects. The divine mercy is concerned with sins and the penalties of sin *(peccata et poenae peccati),* for which satisfaction must be given *(satisfactio).* In all these respects the Mass produces all the effects of a true impetratory and propitiatory sacrifice.

a) A convincing Scriptural argument can be construed on the basis of the Tridentinc Council[6] as follows: Among the numerous sacrifices of the Old Testament there were not only sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, but likewise sacrifices of impétration and propitiation.[0] Now, the New Testament, as the antitype of the Old, must also have a sacrifice that serves and suffices for all these objects. But, according to the prophecy of Malachias, the only sacrifice of the New Testament is the Mass. Consequently the Mass is an impetratory and propitiatory sacrifice.

The propitiatory character of the Mass may furthermore be deduced from the following considerations: According to Heb. V, i, every priest is ordained for the purpose "that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins."[7] Now the Mass is a true sacrifice and its celebrant

6 Sees. XXII, cap. 1.

β Cfr. Lev. IV sqq.; 2 Kings XXIV, 21 sqq.; 2 Mach. HI, 32.

t χνα ττροσφ^ρ-η δωρά re καi Ουσία, ὑπiρ ἁμαρτ.ὡρ

a true priest. Therefore, the Mass must be a true sacrifice of propitiation. This conclusion is expressly stated in the words wherewith our Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist. Matth. XXVI, 28: "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." 8

Is there Biblical warrant for the Tridentine teaching that the Mass may be offered also for the dead?

Christ's words, as quoted, are general, and there is no reason to except the dead. Moreover, we know from the Second Book of the Machabees9 that in the Old Testament sacrifices were offered for the sins of the dead, and hence it is perfectly legitimate to conclude that the Mass must serve the same purpose.

b) The chief source of our dogma, however, is Tradition. The impetratory and propitiatory value of the Mass is clearly apparent both from the teaching of the Fathers and from the ancient liturgies.

a) Tertullian testifies that the early Christians "sacrificed for the welfare of the emperor." 10 St. Cyril of Jerusalem describes the liturgy of the Mass of his day as follows: " Over this sacrifice of propitiation " we pray to God for the universal peace of the churches, for the proper guidance of the world, for the emperor, soldiers, and companions, for the infirm and the sick, for those stricken with trouble, and in general for all in need of help we pray and offer up this sacrifice." " The last-quoted phrase shows that St. Cyril ascribes the efficacy

» *els Αφισιν ἁμαρτιῦ»·*

0 *i* Mach. XII. 43 sqq.

ia/Id Scapul-, a: "Itaque et sacrificamus fro salute imperatoris."

›› *ταύτημ προσφίρομ^ ττ)» 9υσlar-*

ti Catech. Myst., 5, η. β (Migne. *P- C-,* XXXIII, ms).

of the Mass directly to its sacrificial character. At the time of St. Chrysostom, Mass was said " for the fruits of the earth and other needs." 13

This argument is confirmed by the ancient liturgies, which contained masses for travellers, for bridal couples, for rain, etc.

β) The Fathers and the ancient liturgies also attest the fact that in the primitive Church Mass was offered up as a propitiatory sacrifice alike for the living and the dead.

St. Jerome says: " [The bishop] daily offers an undefiled sacrifice for his own sins and those of the people." 14 St. Augustine compares the Mass with the Levitic sacrifices of the Old Law and says that it effects the remission of sins.16 St. Gregory the Great writes: "This Victim in a singular manner preserves the soul from eternal damnation."10

The ancient liturgy of St. James1T has the following passage: "We implore Thy goodness, that this sacrifice may not tend to the judgment of Thy people, since it is instituted for our salvation, for the forgiveness of sins, for the remission of follies, and as a thanksgiving to Thee." 18

Masses for the dead were common in the early Church.

13 *Hom.* tn *Act.,* 21, n. 4.

n *In Tit.,* 1, 8: " *Quotidie [episcopus] pro* suis *populique peccatis illibatos Deo oblaturus est hostias."*

13 *Quacst.* in *Lev.,* 57: *" Illis sacrificiis* unum *hoc sacrificium* [Missa] *significabatur, in quo vere fit remissio peccatorum, a cuius tamen sacrificii sanguine in alimentum sumendo* no» solum nemo *prohibetur, sed ad bibendum potius omnes exhortantur,* qui *volunt habere vi-*

to Dial., IV, 58: *"Haec victima singulariter ab aeterno interitu animam salvat."*

it Apud Kenaudot, *Lit. Orient. Collect.,* II. p. 30.

18 Other examples from ancient liturgies are quoted by Tepe, *Inst. Thcol.,* Vol. IV, pp. 337 Sq.

Tertullian exhorts a widow to have the holy Sacrifice offered up for her departed husband on the anniversary of his death.[10] The Church of Carthage forbade priests to act as civil guardians of children under penalty of having no masses said for the repose of their souls. St. Cyprian enforced this law strictly against a disobedient priest named Victor.[19] St. Augustine wrote a special treatise on "How to Help the Dead."—"We read in the books of the Machabees," he says, "that a sacrifice was offered for the dead; but even if we read nothing like this anywhere in the ancient Scriptures, there is the weighty authority of the universal Church, which observes the custom of giving a place in the prayers of the priest at the altar, to the commendation of the dead."[21] His mother, St. Monica, on her death-bed had asked him to offer Masses for the repose of her soul, and Augustine in describing her funeral says: "And now behold the body is carried out to be buried; and I *go* and return without tears. Neither in those prayers which we poured forth to Thee, when the sacrifice of our ransom was offered to Thee for her, the body being set down by the grave, before the interment of it, as custom is there, — neither in those prayers, I say, did I shed any tears."[22]

19 De *Monog.,* to: *"Pro anima eius refrigerium adpostulet [vidua] et offerat [scil. per sacerdotem] annuis diebus dormitionis eius."*

20 *Ep.* 66, n. a: *"Non est quod pro dormitione eius apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomino eius in Ecclesia frequentetur."*— For the testimony of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *v. supra,* p. 3a6.

21 *De Cura Gerenda pro Mortuis,* c. I, n. 3·· *"In Machabaeorum libris legimus oblatum pro mortuis sacrificium; sed etsi nusquam in Scripturis veteribus omnino legeretur, non parva est universae Ecclesiae. quae in hac consuetudine daret, auctoritas, ubi* in *precibus sacerdotis, quae Domino Deo ad eius altare funduntur, locum suum habet etiam commendatio mortuorum."*

M Confess., IX, ta: *"Quum ecce corpus elatum esi. imus, redimus sine lacrimis. Nam neque* tn *eis precibus quas tibi fudimus, quum offerretur pro ea sacrificium pretii nostri, iam lu.rta sepulcrum posito cadavere, priusquam deponeretur, sic illic fieri solet, nec in eis precibus devi."*

From the innumerable ancient liturgies which testify to the belief of the Church on this head, we will quote only one prayer. It is taken from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory and reads as follows: "I will offer Thee this reasonable, unbloody sacrifice with a clear conscience, for the remission of my sins and iniquities, for the forgiveness of the crimes of Thy people, for the repose and refreshment of our fathers who have passed away in the true faith."[23]

3. Masses in Honor of the Saints.—It enters into the very concept of the Mass as a sacrifice of adoration and praise that it can be offered to God alone. To offer sacrifice to a creature would be idolatry. This applies in a special manner to the Mass, in which the God-man Himself is the sacrificial victim. It is quite a different thing, however, to offer the Mass in honor of the saints, *i. e.* to thank God for their exaltation in Heaven, and to procure for us their efficacious intercession.

Here is the authentic explanation of the Tridentine Council: "Although the Church has been accustomed at times to celebrate certain Masses in honor and memory of the saints, she does not, therefore, teach that sacrifice is offered unto them, but unto God alone, who crowned them; whence neither is the priest wont to say: 'I offer sacrifice to thee, Peter or Paul,' but, giving thanks

[23] *Apud* Renaudot, *Lit. Orient. Collect.,* I, p. 26: *"Offeram tibi hoc sacrificium rationabile, incruentum cum conscientia pura* in remissionem *peccatorum et iniquitatum mearum, veniam delictorum populi* tui, *requiem et refrigerium Patrum nostrorum qui olim obdormierunt in fide orthodoxa."*—On Masses for the dead sec Dellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* VI, 2, 7; De Augustinis, *De Re Sacrament.,* Vol. I, 2nd ed , pp. 774 sqq.

to God for their victories, he implores their patronage. . . 24 With this threefold limitation, Masses in honor of the saints are certainly no base imposture, as the Lutherans allege, but perfectly legitimate. The Council of Trent defines: "If any one saith that it is an imposture to celebrate Mass in honor of the saints, and for obtaining their intercession with God, as the Church intends, let him be anathema."25*

The Catholic practice is approved by antiquity. The early Christians were wont to celebrate Mass in honor of the martyrs on the day of their death and to erect altars over their graves. Tertullian testifies that Mass was offered in memory of the martyrs every year.2* St. Cyprian says of two famous martyrs, St. Lawrence and St. Ignatius: "We offer sacrifices for them always, as you remember, as often as we commemorate the anniversary of their suffering and death." ,T The commemoration of the saints has a place in practically all of the ancient Mass liturgies. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in describing the liturgy of his day, says: "We then commemorate the departed, and first of all the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God may, through their prayers and intercession, graciously accept our supplications."28

24 Sess. XXII, cap. 3: *"Et quamvis in honorem et memoriam sanctorum nonnullas interdum Missas Ecclesia celebrare consueverit, non tamen illis sacrificium offerri docet, sed Deo soli, qui illos coronavit, unde nec sacerdos dicere solet: Offero tibi sacrificium, Petre vel Paule, sed Deo de illorum victoriis gratias agens eorum patrocinia implorat."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 94«).

as *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XXII, cati. 5: *"Si quis direrit, impostu-ram esse Missas celebrare in honorem sanctorum et pro illorum intercessione apud Deum obtinendi, sicut Ecclesia intendit, anathema sit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart. n. 95a).

sa De Coron., c. 3: *"Oblationes pro nalalitiis [martyrum] annud dio facimus."* (Migne. *P. L.,* II, 79).

2T *Ep.,* J9, n. 3: *"Sacrificia pro iis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversariâ commemoratione celebramus."* (Ed. Hartel. II. $8j).

23 *Catech. Mysi..* $, n. 9.— On the veneration and invocation of the sainte in general see l'uhle-Preuaa,

When the Fathers and the ancient liturgies speak of Mass as being offered *for* the martyrs, the preposition *pro (imp)* means not " for the repose or salvation," but in honor of *(pro honore),* in the sense of veneration *(cultus duliae)* ; for the saints in Heaven, having attained the beatific vision, no longer need our prayers.[29] The reprobates in hell cannot profit by the Mass because they are irrevocably lost.[30] Consequently, there remain only the living on earth and the poor souls in purgatory who are able to participate in the fruits of the Holy Sacrifice.

Among the living on earth the fruits of the Mass apply in the first place to those who are in the state of sanctifying grace, secondly to those Christians who arc in mortal sin. Heretics and excommunicated Catholics, Jews and Mohammedans, pagans and infidels are not excluded from the benefits of the Holy Sacrifice, though the Church has limited the application of its so-called special fruits[31] in regard to non-Catholics.

Mariology, pp. 13g sqq. On the subject of this subdivision cfr. Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia,* VI, 8.

29 Cfr. Bickell, *Messe «nd Pascha,* pp. 136 sqq., Mayence *1872.*

30 See Eschatology.

31 *V. infra,* Sect. *2,* No. 3.

SECTION 2

IN WHAT MANNER THE MASS PRODUCES ITS EFFECTS

The effects of the Mass as well as the manner of its efficacy ultimately depend on the value of the Mass, and hence we shall have to devote some space to this "celebrated and much controverted question."[1]

The efficacy of the Mass is partly *ex opere operato,* and partly,— we may say, for the most part,— *ex opere operantis.* That is to say, the *opus operans, i. e.* the proper disposition of those whom it is to benefit, plays a far more important rôle in the application of the fruits of the Mass than is generally supposed.

The last question to be considered is whether the forgiveness of sins effected by the Mass is immediate or only mediate.

1. Value of the Mass.—The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass has both an intrinsic and an extrinsic value. Its intrinsic value is derived from the objective dignity of Christ, who is both its High Priest and Sacrificial Victim. Its extrinsic value consists in the sum-total of the concrete effects which the Mass produces by virtue of the application of the fruits of the atonement.

1 Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 79, sect. 1, n. 1.

a) The intrinsic value of the Mass, like that of the Sacrifice of the Cross, is, of course, infinite.

Every act of the God-man possesses infinite value in the eyes of God.[2] Needless to say, the action of Christ in the Mass creates no new values, but simply applies the thesaurus of the merits and satisfactions contained in the Sacrifice of the Cross to the faithful. "The fruits of this bloody oblation," says the Council of Trent, "are received most plentifully through this unbloody one."[3]

As regards the extrinsic value of the Mass, we must first of all distinguish between sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving on the one hand, and sacrifices of impétration and propitiation on the other. The first two are directed to God alone and cannot be applied to man, and hence a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving offered up by the Son of God Himself (in the name of humanity) must be infinite, since God cannot but take infinite pleasure in the praise and thanksgiving of His only-begotten Son.

b) The case is different with sacrifices of impétration and propitiation.

a) Theologians generally[4] agree that in itself *(in actu primo)* the Mass, as a sacrifice of impétration and propitiation, has infinite power, because impétration and propitiation performed by the God-man must have the same infinite value as praise and thanksgiving, though they may not attain their full effect on account of the limitations of human nature. It follows that intensively *{intensive)* the external value of the Mass as a sacrifice of impe-

2 Cfr. Pohlc-Preuss, *Chrislology,* pp. 161 sqq·; *Sotcriology,* pp. 70 sqq.

3 Sess. XXII. cap. 2: *"Cuius qutdem oblationis cruentae fructus fer hanc incruentam uberrime percipiuntur."*

4 With but few exceptione, among them Bellarmine, *De Eucharist,a,*

tration and propitiation can be but finite This is confirmed by experience, and also by the fact that the Church allows many Masses to be offered for the same purpose. We may fairly ask, however, whether in its application (in *actu secundo)* and extensively *(extensive)* the value of the Mass is also merely finite. Or, to put it somewhat differently,— Can the value of the Mass, which is intensively finite, be applied *ad infinitum* to any number of persons in such a manner that its efficacy is in no wise diminished? Or do the individual beneficiaries share in the fruits *pro rata?* Rather than answer this question in the negative, many theologians prefer to hold that the Mass is of infinite value also *extensive,* and that the amount of the fruits each beneficiary receives, varies in proportion to his piety, worthiness, and devotion, in short, depends on "the work of the agent" *(ex opere operantis).* Surely, indeed, he would be a poor Christian who would expect wonders from the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in spite of his own indifference.5

β) Nevertheless, the question must be answered with a distinction.® In addition to the active there are also passive participators in the Sacrifice of the Mass. These are the persons in whose favor,— it may be without their knowledge and against their wishes,— the Holy Sacrifice is offered. As regards the active participants, *i. e.* the celebrating priest and the attending faithful, the distributive value of the Mass does not depend on the number of those who take part in it. If this were the case, it could be truly said that the fewer people in attendance, the greater the fruits derived by those actually present. But this is contrary to the mind of the Church and the belief of the faithful. Each active participant receives

ft See No. >, *infra.*
«Cfr. Suarez. *Oe Eucharutiri.* di«p. 79, aecl a.

as much of the fruits of the Mass as his personal worthiness and devotion entitle him to. It is not possible to assign a definite limit.

The question lies somewhat differently with the passive participators, t. *e.* those in whose favor the Holy Sacrifice is offered.

c) On this point theologians differ widely. The minority (Cajetan, Ledesma, Gonet, Vasquez, St. Alphonsus, Ballerini, *et al.),* hold that the applicable value of the Holy Sacrifice is infinite, and that a single Mass offered for a hundred persons or intentions is as efficacious as a hundred Masses celebrated for a single person or intention.[7]

Billuart[8] alleges in favor of this view that "the infinite dignity of both the sacrificial Gift and the sacrificing High Priest Jesus Christ cannot be limited by the finite sacrificial activity of the human minister," and after carefully weighing all reasons pro and con, arrives at the conclusion that both opinions are probable but neither is certain.[9] For the rest, even the opponents of this view readily admit that the value of a Mass, as a sacrifice of impétration, suffers no diminution by its being offered for many persons or intentions, because the divine mercy and bounty cannot be limited in the same way as divine justice, which, in matters of debt, must enforce strict equity. For this reason, they say, the Church prays for

[7] Cfr. Gonet, disp. 11, art. 5, n. 100: *"Dico tertio, hoc sacrificium oblatum pro pluribus aeque prodest cuilibet, ac si pro* uno ianlu») *offeratur."*

[8] *De Eucharistia,* diss. 8, ari. 5.

[9] *Ibid.: "Ceterum utraque est probabilis, et quamvis in secundam propendere videar, agnosco tamen* neutra»! *esse certam. sed quamlibet pati* Jtiar *difficultates."*

the Pope, the Ordinary of the diocese, and the faithful generally in the Canon of every Mass, regardless of whether or not the celebrant has received a stipend compelling him to apply its special fruits to some particular person or intention. There is no danger that these special fruits will be in any way diminished or curtailed.

The overwhelming majority of Catholic theologians [10] incline to the conviction that the satisfactory value of a Mass, which is directed to the remission of the temporal punishments of sin, is so strictly circumscribed and limited from the outset, that it accrues pro rata (according to the greater or less number of the individuals living or dead, for whom the Sacrifice is offered) to each of the individual beneficiaries.

Many authors hold this to be true also of the impetratory and the propitiatory value of the Mass. Their view finds strong support in the custom prevailing among the faithful of having several Masses celebrated for the deceased or for their special intentions. Only on such a hypothesis [11] is it possible to understand why a parish priest is strictly bound to apply the Mass to his parishioners on Sundays and holydays of obligation.[1*] Only on such a hypothesis, finally, is it possible to explain why the Church has forbidden in strict justice that a priest should seek to fulfil the obligations imposed by several stipends by reading a single Mass.[13]

10 A list of them is given by Tepe. *Inst. Thcol., Vol.* IV, p. 347.

11 Cfr. *Cone. Trident.,* Sess. XXIII. cap. 1. *De Ref.*

13 Benedict XIV, Const. *"Quum semper oblatas,"* J a: "A're *illud pro aliis applicare ant pro huiusmodi applicatione eleemosynam percipere posse."*

13 *Prop, ab cllesendro VII. Damn, a.* 166s, prop, io: *"Non est cantra*

Tournely adduces in favor of this view important internal grounds of probability, *c. g.:* the will of God to see the Holy Sacrifice offered as often as possible and with the largest possible attendance on the part of the faithful; the general rule of Divine Providence to allow all natural and supernatural causes to produce their effects slowly and gradually ; and, finally, the most holy intention of God that man should, by his personal exertions, strive through the medium of the greatest possible number of Masses to participate in the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross.1*

2. The Mass Produces Its Effects Partly ex Opere Operato and Partly ex Opere Operantis.—How the Mass works its effects is rather difficult to explain. In every Mass four distinct categories of persons really participate. They are:

(a) The High Priest Jesus Christ Himself *(sacerdos principalis s. primarius')* ;

(b) The Church, His mystic Bride and representative on earth ;

(c) The celebrant *(sacerdos ministerialis s. secundarius)* ;

(d) All those who, besides the celebrant, participate actively in the sacrifice.

That in addition to the *opus operatum,* there must, in general, also be an *opus operantis,* is evi-

turhfiam, *pro pluribus sacrificiis stipendium accipere el sacrificium unum offerre."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 1110).— Cfr. De Lugo, *De Eucharistia* disp. 19, sect. 12; Th. Specht, *Die IVirkungcn des eucharistischen Opfers,* § 29.

1* Tournely, *De Eucharistia,* qu. 8, art. 6. Billuart's answer in *De Eucharistia,* diss. 8, art. 5,

dent from the fact that the efficacy of the Mass depends not only on the objective dignity of the sacrificial gift, but likewise on the subjective worthiness and disposition of the celebrant and the faithful.

a) To make the Sacrifice of the Cross fruitful for us, and to secure its application, Christ, the High Priest, offers Himself as a sacrifice which is quite independent of the merits or demerits of the Church, the celebrant, or the faithful present at the Mass, and consequently is for these an *opus operatum.* In regard to God, of course, Christ's theandric act of offering Himself as a sacrifice constitutes an *opus operantis.* This peculiar kind of efficacy is one of the essential distinctions between the Sacrifice of the New Testament and the sacrifices of the Old, as was pointed out by the Tridentine Council: "This is indeed that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice of those that offer [it]." 165

b) Next after Christ, and in the second place, comes the Church as a juridical person, who, according to the express teaching of the same Council,10 has received from her Divine Founder the institution of the Mass and also the commission constantly to ordain priests who will celebrate this most holy Sacrifice unto the end of time. St. Augustine speaks of "the daily sacrifice of the Church, who, being the body of the Head, offers up herself through Him."17 As the Church is

15 Sess. XXII, cap. 1: *"Et haec quidem illa munda oblatio est, quae nullâ indignitate aut malitia offerentium inquinari potest.'*

IB Sess. XXII, cap. 1: *" Ut dilectae sponsae suae Ecclesiae visibile relinqueret sacrificium. . . . notum instituit pascha seipsum ab Ecclesia per sacerdotes sub signis visibilibus immolandum."*

it *De Civ. Dei, X, ao:* ". . . *quotidianum Ecclesiae sacrificium.*

the "beloved Bride of Christ," her daily sacrifice cannot but be agreeable to God, even though the celebrant should happen to be an unworthy priest; for, acting in his official capacity, even an unworthy priest offers a valid sacrifice, which, being the sacrifice of the Church as well as the self-sacrifice of Christ, remains essentially spotless and untarnished before God. From this point of view there are no "private Masses," inasmuch as every Mass is offered in the name and by commission of the Church and therefore constitutes a solemn and public act of divine worship. "The sacred and holy Synod [of Trent] . . . does not . . . condemn, as private and unlawful, but approves of and therefore commends those Masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, since those Masses also ought to be considered as truly common, partly because the people communicate spiritually thereat, partly also because they arc celebrated by a public minister of the Church, not for himself only, but for all the faithful. . . ."[18]

To this special sacrificial activity of the Church, offering up the Holy Sacrifice together with Christ, there corresponds as a special fruit an ecclesiastico-human merit, which, as De Lugo points out,[10] is lost when Mass is said by an excommunicated or suspended priest, because such a priest no longer acts in the name and with the commission of the Church.

We are compelled to concur in another view of Cardinal De Lugo, namely, that the value of the Mass is dependent on the greater or lesser holiness of the reigning pope, the

quae quum ipsius capitis corpus sit, seipsam per ipsum discit offerre."

18 Sess. XXII, cap. 6: *"Nec tamen* [Ecclesia] *Missas illas . . .* ut *privatas et illicitas damnat, sed probat atque adeo commendat, siquidem illae quoque Missae vere communes censeri debent, partim quod in eis populus Christianus spiritualités communicat, partim vero quod a publico Ecclesiae ministro non pro se tantum, sed pro omnibus fidelibus . . . celebrentur."*

10 De Eucharistia, disp. 10, sect 9. n. 126.

bishops, and the clergy throughout the world. The holier the Church is in her members (especially the pope and the episcopate), the more agreeable must be her sacrifice in the eyes of God. The human merit of the Church in offering up the Sacrifice of the Mass is, therefore, an *opus operans* of the Church as such, and consequently, being independent of the worthiness of the celebrant and the faithful, constitutes for these an *opus operatum,* which has impetratory effects similar to those produced by the sacramentels.

c) With Christ and the Church is associated in the third place the celebrating priest, the representative through whom Christ offers up the sacrifice. If he be a man of great personal devotion, holiness, and purity, there will accrue an additional fruit, which will benefit himself and those in whose favor he applies the Mass. Hence the faithful are guided by a sound instinct when they prefer to have Mass celebrated by an upright and holy priest rather than by an unworthy one, since, in addition to the chief fruit of the Mass, they secure this special fruit, which springs *ex opere operantis* from the piety of the celebrant and is for them, therefore, an *opus operatum.*

d) In the fourth place must be mentioned those who take an active part in the Sacrifice of the Mass. *e. g.* the servers, sacristan, organist, singers, and, finally, the whole congregation. All these individuals gather fruits in proportion to their personal dispositions. The more fervent a prayer, the richer its fruit. Most intimate is the active participation in the sacrifice of those who receive holy Communion, since in their case the fruits of Communion are added to those of the Mass.

Aside from sacramental Communion, the most effective way of participating in the benefits of the Mass is by

communicating spiritually, which means to have an ardent desire to receive the Eucharist with the priest. The Tridentine Council says: "The sacred and holy Synod would fain indeed that, at each Mass, the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but also by the sacramental participation of the Eucharist, that thereby a more abundant fruit might be derived from this most holy sacrifice." [20]

A third means of deriving spiritual profit from the Mass is by making the intention of participating spiritually in all the Masses celebrated daily throughout the world. This intention is all the more fruitful if it is made at Mass itself.

Since the benefits thus obtained are proportionate to the disposition of the individual and the purity of his motives, they are plainly acquired *ex opere operantis.*[21]

3. The Threefold Fruit of the Mass.—The effects of the Mass, which it produces *ex opere operato,* whether they be impetratory or propitiatory, are commonly called its "fruits." The beneficiaries of these fruits are called passive participants in the Holy Sacrifice.[22] They fall into three categories: the community, the person or persons to whom the Mass is especially applied, and the celebrant.

20 Sess. XXII, cap. 6: *" Optaret quidem sacrosancta Synodus,* tit tn *singulis Missis fideles adstanles* non «olui» sfiriiuati *affectu, scd sacramentali etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent, quo od eos sanctissimi huius sacrificii fructus uberior proveniret."*

21 Cfr. De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 19, sect. 11.

22 Of course, the active participants in the Mass are also passive participants in the sense above explained, in fact they are benefitted by the fruits of the Holy Sacrifice in a particular manner.

a) According to the intention of our Divine Lord and His Church, every Mass that is celebrated, is offered up by the priest for those present at the Sacrifice, for the holy Catholic Church, the pope, the bishop of the diocese, for all faithful Christians, whether living or dead, and for the salvation of the whole world. From this there results first of all a "general fruit" *(fructus generalis)* for all mankind, the bestowal of which lies immediately in the will of Christ and His Church, and can be frustrated by no special intention on the part of the celebrant. Scotus and a few other theologians hold that by virtue of this general fruit of the Holy Sacrifice every individual member of the Church receives a remission of the temporal punishment due to his sins from every single Mass celebrated on the face of the earth; but this theory is extremely doubtful.[23]

b) The second kind of fruit *(fructus specialis)* is usually applied to particular living or deceased persons according to the intention of the celebrant or the donor of a stipend. The practice of giving and receiving Mass stipends is based on the maxim enunciated by St. Paul that he who serves the altar shall live thereof. This special fruit of the Mass (called also *ministerialis* or *medius)* must be applied by the priest, who has received a stipend, according to the intention of the donor. Its "application" rests so exclusively with the priest that even the prohibition of the Church cannot render it inefficacious, though the celebrant

Ï3 Cfr. Suarez, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 79, sect. 8, n. *a.*

would sin through disobedience were he to oppose her commands.

Since the effect of an application can be frustrated by circumstances (c. *g.* if a Mass were said for a deceased person already in Heaven), Suarez [21] advises priests always to add to the first a second intention *(intentio secunda),* which, should the first be inefficacious, will take its place.

That there is a special fruit of the Mass, which can be applied to either the living or the dead, according to the intention of the celebrant, though not an article of faith, is the express teaching of the Church. The contrary assertion of the Jansenist Council of Pistoia [26] was condemned by Pius VI in his dogmatic Bull *"Auctorem Fidei."* [20] The practice of offering Masses for particular persons or intentions goes back to the primitive Church [27] and would be absolutely unintelligible had not the Church believed in the doctrine under consideration.

c) The third and last kind of fruit *(fructus personalis s. specialissimus)* falls to the personal share of the celebrant, since,— apart from his worthiness and piety *(opus operantis),*— it were unfair that he should come empty-handed from the Sacrifice. This fruit of the Mass is entirely personal and most probably cannot be applied to others.

Although the development of the ecclesiastical teaching in regard to the threefold fruit of the

24 *Op. cit.,* disp. 79, sect. io.

25 ·'. . . quasi *nullus specialis fructus proveniret ex speciali applicatione, qua»i pro determinatis personis* aut *personarum ordinibus faciendam commendat ac praecipit Ecclesia, speciatim a pastoribus pro suis ovibus."* (Denzingcr-Bannwart, n. 1530).

20 '■ *Falsa, temeraria, perniciosa, Ecclesiae iniuriosa, inducens in errorem alias damnatum in Wicleffo."* K. *supra,* Sect. i.

Mass begins only with Scotus,[28] it is based on the very essence of the Sacrifice itself.[29]

4. The Special Mode of Efficacy of the Mass as a Sacrifice of Propitiation.—As a propitiatory sacrifice the Mass has a double function, *i. e.* to obliterate actual sins *{effectus propitiatorius),* and to take away such temporal punishments as may still remain to be endured for sins forgiven *{effectus satisfactorily).* Both effects are expressly mentioned by the Tridentine Council.[30]

A problem of some difficulty is whether this double effect *ex opere operato* is produced mediately or immediately.

a) Regarding mortal sins, we maintain as certain, in opposition to some older theologians, that the Mass can never accomplish the *forgiveness of* such sins otherwise than by way of exciting contrition and penance, and therefore only mediately through procuring for the sinner the grace of conversion.

a) Aragon and Casalius held that the Mass remits mortal sins *per sc,* in the same way as Baptism and Penance. Gregory of Valentia maintained that it remits them *per accidens* after the fashion of certain Sacraments of the living. Neither view is tenable, since even the Sacrifice of the Cross itself, from which the Mass de-

ae *Quaest. Quodlib.,* I. ao, n. 4.

2B Cfr. BeJIartnine, *De Eucharistia.* VI, 6 sqq·; Th. Specht, *Die ll irkungeti des eucharislischen Opfers, pp. 149* sqq.

aoSes*. XXII. can. j.

rives its entire efficacy, does not effect the immediate forgiveness of mortal sins, but merely bestows certain efficacious graces, by means of which the sinner can attain justification, either through making an act of perfect contrition or worthily receiving the Sacrament of Penance. To say that the Mass blots out mortal sins immediately and *ex opere operato,* is to confuse it with the Sacraments of the dead and to deny their necessity (*necessitas medii)* for salvation. St. Thomas says: "The Eucharist, in so far as it is a sacrifice, . . . blots out mortal sins, not as a proximate cause, but by securing the grace of contrition."[31] The Council of Trent approves this teaching: "The holy Synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory. . . . For the Lord, appeased by the oblation thereof, and granting the grace and gift of penitence, forgives even heinous crimes and sins."[32] This conciliary definition indicates in how far the propitiatory efficacy of the Mass is derived *ex opere operato.* God is first appeased by the oblation and subsequently moved to grant sufficient (though not necessarily efficacious) graces to enable the sinner to make a worthy confession or an act of perfect contrition.

β) As regards venial sins, the Tridentine Council says that the salutary virtue of the unbloody Sacrifice is "applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit."[33] From this Melchior Cano, Henriquez, Azor, and a few other theologians concluded that the Mass, as a sac-

81 *Comment. in Sent.,* IV, dist. 12, p. a, art. 2: *Eucharistia, inquantum est sacrificium, . . , peccata mortalia* in *cis delet non sicut causa proxima, sed* inquanlum *gratiam contritionis ei* impetrat."*

32 Sees. XXII. cap. 2: *"Docet sancta Synodus, sacrificium istud vere propiliutorium esse. . . . Huius quippe oblatione placatus Dominus gratiam et donum poenitentiae concedens crimina et peccata etiam ingentia dimittit."* (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 940).

83 . in *remissionem eorum, quae a nobis quotidie committuntur peccatorum."* (Sess. XXII, cap. 1).

rifice of expiation, directly blots out venial sins. But this deduction is unwarranted. On the contrary, it is the common teaching of Catholic theologians that the forgiveness of venial sins also requires actual grace, *i. e.* the grace of contrition.[34] The Mass as such is a Sacrifice, not a Sacrament. The following argument is as simple as it is convincing: If the pious attendance at Mass, or the efficacious application of the Holy Sacrifice, is unable to earn for any one immediately the first grace of justification, then it is also unable to merit the so-called *justificatio secunda,* which consists in an increase of sanctifying grace. The contrary hypothesis would entail the absurd conclusion that to have Masses said for the souls of baptized children would increase the sacramental grace of Baptism *ad infinitum.*

b) Concerning the remission of the temporal punishments due to sin, our judgment must be different.

The reason lies in the intrinsic distinction between sin and its punishment. Without the personal cooperation and sorrow of the sinner, forgiveness is impossible. This cannot, however, be said of a mere remission of punishment. One person may validly discharge the debts of another, without apprizing the debtor of his intention.

a) The satisfactory effect of the Mass is immediate and wrought *ex opere operato.* This can be shown as follows: The Council of Trent defines that the souls in purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, "principally by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar."[35] This help must come immediately and *ex opere operato,* be-

[34] Cfr. De Lugo, *De Eucharistia,* disp. 19. sect. 9, n. 15.

[35] *potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio iuvari"* (SeM. XXV, *De Purg.;* Denzinger-Bannwart. n. p8j).

cause a dead person can no longer give satisfaction for his sins *(satisfacere)* by acquiring supernatural merits; all he can do is to atone for them by suffering *(satispati).* There is no reason to assume that the case is different with the living, and consequently the satisfactory effect of the Mass with them, too, is immediate and *ex opere operato.*

β) In order to make sure of the *fructus specialis* of the Mass as a sacrifice of satisfaction, a person must (i) be capable of receiving those fruits; he must (2) be in the state of pilgrimage; he must (3) have the right disposition, and (4) stand in need of satisfaction.

(1) To be able to receive these fruits, a person must be baptized. Baptism is the "spiritual door" not only to the Sacraments, but also to the Sacrifice of the Mass in so far as it is a sacrifice of propitiation. Its impetratory effects can be applied also to non-believers.

(2) To receive the special fruits of the Mass as regards satisfaction for the temporal punishments of sin, one must be in the state of pilgrimage *(in statu viae).* The attainment of the *status termini* either in Heaven or in hell renders all satisfaction either unnecessary or impossible. As regards the middle state of purgatory, we have already shown that the fruits of the Mass can be applied to the poor souls. Is this application infallible? Soto, Cano, and others doubt it, for the reason that the *effectus satisfactorius* of the Mass can be applied to the departed only *per modum suffragii.* Nevertheless, the majority of theologians hold with Suarez[80] that Masses for the dead infallibly remit, if not all, at least part of the punishments due to their sins.

(3) The recipient must have the right disposition, that

[8U] *De Eucharitia,* disp. 79, sect. 10, n. 3 sqq

is, he must be in the state of sanctifying grace." The punishments due to mortal sins cannot be remitted until the sins have been blotted out.

(4) Finally, the recipient must stand in need of satisfaction. This condition would be absent in the case of one who had already obtained remission of all the punishments due to his sins by either actively or passively making satisfaction for them. One who is in the state of mortal sin clearly stands in need of such satisfaction, though the need cannot be satisfied until he has obtained forgiveness of his sins by a worthy confession.[38]

Readings: — G. Sanchez, *Spiritualis Thesaurus Missae,* Ingolstadt 1620.—'Cardinal Bona, *De Sacrificio Missae Tractatus /isceticus,* new ed., Ratisbon 1909.— K. Weickum, *Das hl, Messopfer, Handbuch fur Prediger und Katecheten,* Ratisbon 1865. — J. Kôssing, *Liturgische Erkliirung der hl. Messe,* 3rd ed., Ratisbon 1869.— J. P. Olivier, *Solutions Théologiques et Liturgiques Touchant le Saint Sacrifice de la Messe,* Paris 1873.— *Thos. Specht, *Die Wirkungen des cucharistischen Opfers,* Augsburg 1876.— M. Müller, *The Holy Mass, the Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead,* New York 1879.— L. Bacuez, *Du Divin Sacrifice et du Prêtre qui le Célébré,* Paris 1888.— Kl. Liidtke, *Erkldrung des hi. Messopfers,* Danzig 1892.—J. Walter, *Die hl. Messe, der grossie Schats der Welt,* 7th ed., Brixen 1909.—N. Gihr, *Das hl. Messopfer dogmatisch, liturgisch und assetisch erkldrt,* nth ed., Freiburg 1912; (English translation. *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass Dogmatically, Liturgically, and Ascetically Explained,* 4th ed., St. Louis 1914).— Cardinal Vaughan, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,* 2nd ed., St. Louis 1900.— W. *J.* Kelly, *The Veiled Majesty, or Jesus in the Eucharist,* London 1903.— A. Devine, C. P., *The Sacraments Explained,* 3rd ed., pp. 270 sqq., London 1905.— *J. C.* Hedley, O. S. B., *The Holy Eucharist,* pp. 227 sqq., London 1907.

37 Cfr. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol, 3»,* qu. 79. art. 7, ad 3.

38 Cfr. Tepe, *Inst. The* Vol. IV. pp. 35J sqq.

INDEX

Aaron, 43. 280, 305, 329.
Abcrcius, *Stele* of, 84.
Abraham, 106, 302, 305.
Absolute accidents, 145 sqq., 152 sqq.
Accidentia sine subiectQ, 145 sqq.
Adam, 290.
Addai and Mari, Liturgy of, 213. 320.
Adduction, Scotistic theory of, 125 sqq.
Adorableness of the Holy Eucharist, 136 sqq.
Agar, 33, 35.
Alanus of Lille, in.
Albertus Magnus, 98.
Albigenses, 81, 256, 316, 317.
Alexander VIII, 271.
Alexander of Hales, 181.
Alexandria, School of, 73 sq.
Alger of Liège, 48.
Alphonsus de' Liguori, St., 140, 183, 347, 384.
Altars, 281, 315.
Amalarius of Metz,' 161.
Ambrose, St., 66, 121, 138, 200, 250, 320, 327, 334.
Ambrosius Catharinus, 201.
Andrew, St., 323.
Anglicans, 19, 36, 5°. 247, 253, 3°9-
Antioch, School of, 73.
Antoine, 366
Apostles, The, 29 sq., 57, 83, 91, 199, 257-
Apostolic Constitutions, 132 sq., 263, 3'9.
Apparences eucharistiques, 151.
Apparent contradictions in the mystery of the Real Presence, '44 sqq.
Application of the special fruits of the Mass, 391.
Aquarians, 195.
Arians, 260.
Aragon, 393.
Armenians, 82, 193.
Arminians, 50.
Arnauld, 55, 164.
Arriaga, 353.
Artolatria, 26, 14E
Aspersio sanguinis, 282.
Athanasius, St., 61, 26a
Atzberger, 12, 149 sq., 360.
Augsburg Confession, 49.
Augustine, St., 3, 21. 67 sq., 74. 76, 77, 78, 79, '39. 22'. 223. 238 sqq., 270. 278. 285,305, 3-'8 sq., 376, 377. 387.
Auxerre, Council of (578), 266.
Azor, 394.
Asyma, 191 sqq.

B

Ballerine 384-
Banquet, The Eucharistic. 225 sq.. 322.344
Baptism, 133. 237. 23ft 240 sq.. 245. *266.* 395. 30.
Bardenhewer, 75.
Basil, St., 61. i-'2. 206, 250. 320.
Basle, Council of (1431), 246.
Bautz, 363.
Bayma, Jos., S. J., 1IS-
Becanus. 125. 35'.
Bellarmine, Card., 33. ''4. «*5. 126, 165, 181, 182, 25Λ »J, 343.

Bcrengarius, 30, 45, 46, 47 Sq,, 51. 52, 81, in, 114, n6, 161.
Berlage, 363.
Berning, W., 37.
Bessarion, Card., 205, 212.
Bickell, 319.
Billot, Card., 359 sqq., 368.
Billuart, 125, 165, 362, 384.
Bilocation, 181 sqq.
Bisping, 313.
Body, Effect of Communion on the human, 233 sq.
Bonaventure, St., 43, 44, 168, 252.
Bosco, 347.
Bossuet, 164, 362.
Bread as an element of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, 189 sqq.
Bread of Heaven, 2, 11, 12, 15, 227.
Bread of Life, 12, 13, 14 sq.
Bread of the Angels, 2, 265.
Breaking of bread, 1, 85.
Breaking of the host, 342.
Butzer, 129.

C

Cæsarius of Arles, St., 97·
Cain and Abel, 290.
Cajetan, 384.
Calixtines, 246.
Calvin and the Calvinists, 30, 51. 54. 55. 81, 120, 131, 161, 222, 247, 277, 315, 316.
Cano, Melchior, 341 sq., 394, 396.
Canon of the Mass, 209 sqq.
Capharnaum, Christ's discourse at, 10 sqq.
Carlstadt, 32, 50, 81, 129, 315.
Cartesianism, 148, 150 sq., 158, 163 sq.
Carthage, Council of (397). 3'8.
Casajoana, 163.
Casalius, 353, 393·
Catacombs, 83 sq.
Catechumens, 266, 273.
Catholic Encyclopedia,
Chalcedon, Council of (451), 318.
Chaklæans, 82.
Chalice, 194 sq., 263, 309 sqq.; Not given to the laity, 246
Charles IX, 247.
Cheffontaines, 201.
Chemnitz, 134, 251.
Christology, *6g* sqq., 136.
Chrysostom, St., 20, 47, 63 sq., 74, 94, 121, 122, 132, 161, 200, 205, 206, 212, 223, 259, 320, 327 sq., 376. ,
Cienfuegos, Card., 173, 352, 355. de-
Clement of Alexandria, 73, 190.
Collyridians, 256.
Communion, 2, 14, 21, 22, 6o, 71 sq·, 79 sq., 86, 93, 129, 133» 136, 138, 139. 215, 219, 220 sqq., 230; Under one kind, 246 sqq.; Unworthy, 268 sq.; Preparation required for, 270 sq.; Communion of the priest in the Mass, 343 sqq.
Concomitance, Law of, 88 sqq., 95;
Concupiscence allayed by the Holy Eucharist, 229 sq.
Confirmation, 238.
Consecration, The words of, as form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, 198 .sqq.; What words are essential in, 209 sq.; The minister of, 256 sqq.; The real sacrificial act, 340 sqq.; The double Consecration as the physical essence of the Mass, 345 sqq.
Constance, Council of (1414-1418), 146, 152, 246, 247, 253, 317·
Consubstantiation, 49, 113, 117.
Contenson, 233.
Contradictions, Apparent, In the dogma of the Real Presence, 144 sqq.
Conversion, 103 sqq.
Copts, 82.
Cor. XI, 24 sq.—24 sqq.
Cornelius à Lapide, 300.
Corpus Christi, Feast of, 139 Sq

Corpus Christi Procession, 140.
Corruptio specieruin, 134.
Covenant, 40
Cross, The Mass in its relation to the Sacrifice of the, 332 sqq.
Cyprian, St., 59 sq., 196, 224, 259. 305. 318, 325 sq., 334, 348, 377, 379·
Cyril Lucaris, 81.
Cyril of Alexandria, St, 21, 64 sq·, 71, 73, 90, 121, 131, 368.
Cyril of Jerusalem, St., 61 sq., 75. 90, 96 sq., 121, 138, 319 sq., 326 sq., 375, 379-

D

David, 31.
Deacons, 259, 262 sqq., 318.
Dead, Communion given to the, 266; Masses for the, 376 sq., 385, 395 sq.
De Augustinis, 367.
Decretum pro Armenis, 93 sq., 95 sq., 190, 203, 218, 225, 227.
Definition of the Eucharist, 6 sq.
Dcharbe, 185 sq., 362.
Delectatio spiritualis produced by the Holy Eucharist, *227* sq.
Delitzsch, 13.
•De Lugo, 98, 105, 125, 148, 165, 172, 181, 197, 224, 252, 283, 284, 289, 343. 388.
De Lugo, Card., 352, 365 sqq., 388.
Denis, St, 250.
De San, 181.
Descartes, 150 sq., 163.
Destruction of the sacrificial victim, 283 sqq., 344, 365 sqq.
De Walenburch, 351.
Dicastillo. 362.
Didache, 85, 322.
Dieringer, 363.
Dieterich, 13.
Dignity of the Eucharist, 4 sqq.
Dionysius the Great, 69.
Discipline of the Secret, 2, 57. *73,* 74, 305·
Divinity of Christ 25.
Docetism, 45, 56, 70.
Dositheus, 81.
Dressel, L., S. J., 157.
Drouin, 151.
Durand. 37.
Durandus, 48, 113, 119.
Dynamic presence, 51.
Dynamism, 156 sqq.

E

Eat one's flesh, 16 sq.
Eck, Johann, 341.
Egger, 367.
Einig, 367.
Elias, 66.
Ephesus, Council of (431), 21. 82, 318.
Ephraem, St., 71.
Epiklesis, 198, 202 sqq.; Possesses no consecratory value, 210 sqq., 341.
Epiphanius, St, 74, 260.
Epistula Presbyterorum Achaiae, 323.
Estius, 192, 313.
Eucharistic congresses, 140.
Eucharistic controversies, The three great, 45 sqq.
Eucharistic leagues, 140.
Eugene IV, see *Decretum pro Armenis.*
Eutychius, 97.

F

Fabian, Pope, 242.
Fabri, 164.
Faith alone not sufficient for worthy Communion, 268,
Fast, The Eucharistic, 269 sq., 324-
Fernandez, 163.
Figurative interpretations of Christ's words, 32 sqq.
First Communion of children, 243 sq·
Fish symbol. R4- r
Florence, Council of (1430), 81. tot. 194. 203, 205. 211, 213 sq., 315, 317.

Formula of Concord, 51, 129.
Fourth dimension, 164.
Fractio Panis, 84 sq., 151, 342.
Franzclin, Card., 43, 105, I2Γ, 156, 174, 182, 283, 366 sq.
Frassen, 347.
Frederick William IV, 50.
Frequent Communion, 230, 242 sqq.
Fruits of Communion, 231 ; Of the Mass, 381 sqq.
Fulgentius, St., 239.

G

Gaufred, III.
Gelasius, Pope, 71, 251, 320.
Gerson, Charlier de, 253.
Gihr, 360.
Glossner, 363.
Gnostics, 70, 71.
Gonet, 363, 384.
Gotti, 363.
Gratia sacramentalis of the Eucharist, 226 sq.
Greek schismatic Church, 81 sq., 202 sq.
Gregory the Great, 320, 334 sq., 376, 378.
Gregory VII, 52.
Gregory of Nazianzus, St., 61, 347.
Gregory of Nyssa, St., 61, 121, 205, 368, 369.
Gregory of Valentia, 148, 393.
Guitmund, 48.
Gutberlet, 182, 364, 369.

H

Haan, 182.
Happiness. The Eucharist a pledge of eternal, 232 sqq.
Harnack, Adolph, 67, 83, 195.
Hartmann, Ed. von, 158.
Heavenly Sacrifice of Christ according to Thalhofcr, 358.
Heimbucher, 233.
Henno, 347.
Henriquez, 347, 394.
Heribert of Auxerre, 160 sq.
Heriger, 47.
Hilary, St., 65, 70.
Hildehert of Tours, in
Hippolytus, St., 58 sq.
Hoffmann, J., 13.
Holtzklau, 366.
Holy Ghost as co-consecrator, 213 sqq.
Holy Orders, 257.
Hoppe, L. A., 201.
Host, 4, 159.
Hurtado, C., 362.
Hurter, H., S. J., 156, 367.
Hus and the Hussites, 22, 246 sq.
Hydroparastatac, 195.
Hylomorphism, 155 sqq.
Hylozoism, 158.
Hypostatic Union, 92 sq., 114 sq., 141, 193, 221.

I

Iconoclasts, 22.
Ignatius of Antioch, St., 56 sq., 70, 232, 323.
Immutatio perfectiva, 354.
Impanation, 114, 116.
Increase of sanctifying grace effected by the Holy Eucharist, 222 sqq.
Index, S. Congr. of the, 151.
Infants, The Eucharist not necessary for the salvation of, 236 sqq.; The Eucharist administered to, under the species of wine, 237 sq., 250; Why Communion was given to, in the ancient Church, 240 sq.
Innocent III, 197, 200, 201.
Institution of the Sacrament, 23 sqq.
Irenaeus, St., 1, 58, 71, 191, 196, 204, 324 sq.
Isaias, 301.
Ischyras, 260.

J

Jacob, 31.

Jacobites, 82.
Jacob of Misa, 246.
Jansenism, 271.
Jephta, 352.
Jerome, St., 132. 259, 376.
Jerusalem, Schismatic Council of (1672). 81, 139. 203, 317.
Jews, 18 sq., 40 sq., 266, 328, 380.
John VI, 25—72, IO sqq.
John Damascene, St., 90, 121, 205.
John Darugensis, 82 sq.
John of Paris, 114.
Juliana, St., 140.
Justin Martyr, St., 57, 85, 193, 196, 204, 223, 259, 323.

K

Kabasilas of Thessalonica, 211, 236.
Kahnis, 13.
Keil, 13.
Kelvin, 157.
Kenosis, 284, 354. 359. 366, 369.
Kind, Communion under one, 246 sqq.
Kostlin, 13

L

Lahousse, 182.
Lamy, Th., 65.
Lanfranc, 47, 48.
"La Perpétuité de la Foi" 55.
Last Supper in its relation to the Mass, 339 sq.
Lateran. Fourth Council of the (1215), in, 194, 242, 243, 256, 317.
Lebrun, 211.
Ledesma, 343, 384.
Legrand, 163.
Leibniz, 134. 154. 156.
Leo I, the Great, Pope, 68.
Leo IX, 192.
Leo XIII, 237.
Lessing, 48, 362 sqq.
Lessius, 123, 165, 368.
Liturgies, Ancient, The Real Presence in the, 97; Transubstantiation in, 122 sq; The Epiklesis in, 205 sq; The Mass in. 319 sqq.
Liturgy of St. James, 139, 376.
Loaves of Proposition, 16.
Locutiones sacramentales, y) sqq. z
Loofs, 67.
Lucifcrians, 259.
Lucina, Catacomb of St., 84.
Luke XXII, 19 sqq.—23 sqq.
Luthardt, 251.
Luther, 32 sq., 48 sq., 8r, 113, 117, 129, 222, 247, 256, 27-·, 3'5. 316. 3/2-
Lutheran Church, 50,317.
Lyons, Council of (1274), 81,

M

Macarius Magnes, 60.
Maignan, E., 151.
Malachias, Prophecy of, 295 sqq., 328, 368, 374·
Maldonatus, 21, 238.
Manichæans, 251.
Manna, 14, 15 sq., 27, 66.
Marcus Eugenicus, 2tr.
Mark XIV, 22 sqq.—23 sqq.
Maronites, 82, 193.
Martin V, 146, 152. 246.
Maruthas. Bishop, 36.
Alary, Blessed Virgin, 233.
Mass of the Presanctified, 133. 250 sq.
Mass, The, 272 sqq.; Proved from Scripture and Tradition. 295 sqq.; The argument from prescription, 314 sqq.: The argument from Tradition, 322 sqq.; Nature of the, 331 sqq.; Physical essence. 332 sqq.; Identity with the Sacrifice of the Cross, 337 sq.; Difference between the two sacrifices, 338 sqq.; The Consecration as the real sacrificial act, 340 sqq.; The double Consecration as the physical essence of the Mass, 345 sqq.;

The metaphysical essence, .349 sqq.; Causality of the Mass, 371 sqq.; Effects, 372 sqq.; How produced, 381 sqq.
Mathalias, 31.
Matth. XXV, 26 sqq.—23 sqq.
Maurus, Sylvester, 183.
"Mechanics of the supernatural," 165.
Melanchthon, 49, 51, 129, 315.
Melchisedech, Sacrifice of, 16, 301 sqq., 329, 356, 368.
Melchites, 82, 211.
Mennonites, 50.
Μιτουσίωσιϊ, 112.
Michael Caerularius, 191, 192.
Michael de Maria, 181.
Missa, 273.
Missal, 190.
Mixture, The, 342.
Monadism, 158.
Monica, St., 329, 377.
Monism, 158.
Monophysites, 70 sq., 82 sq., 149 sq., 196, 317 sq.
Montanists, 256.
Moses, 14 sq., 40, 66, 105, 282, 289, 290 sqq.
Multilocation, 175 sqq.
Muniessa, 366.
Mystery of the faith, The Eucharist as a, 5.
Mystery of the Real Presence speculatively discussed, 143 sqq.
Mystical Body of Christ, 37 sq.
Mystic slaying of the Eucharistic Lamb, 311, 360 sq.

N

Names. Different, for the Eucharist, 1 sq.
Necessity of the Holy Eucharist for salvation, 235 sqq.; For children, 236 sqq.; For adults, 241 Sqq.
Nestonans, 70 sq., 82, 83, 317 sq.
Nestorius, 21, 64, 320.
New Testament, 31, 40.
Newton, 156.
Nicaea, First Council of (325) *259,* 318.
Nicaea, Second Council of (787), 22, 82.
Nicetas, 161.
Nicole, 55'.
Nominalists, 173, 182.

O

Oecolampadius, 32, 37, 54, 315.
Offertory, 340 sq.
Optatus, St., 132.
Origen, 73, 74, 160, 190, 193, 259.
Osiander, 114, 117.
Oswald, 42, 159, 163, 240, 363.
Ostwald, 157.
Ozias, 280.

P

Pagan practices resembling the Eucharist, 233 sq.
Pallavicini, 105.
Palmieri, 157.
Paludanus, 119.
Pantheism, 158.
Paris, Council of (1050), 52.
Paschal Lamb, 16, 27, 40, 41.
Paschasius Radbertus, 46 sq., 01.
Pastophoria, 132 sq.
Patristic difficulties against the Real Presence solved, 72 sqq.
Paulinus, 250.
Paul of Samosata, 69.
Paul, St., 15 sq., 26 sq., 39, 40, 77, 85 sq., 94. 181, 193. 199. 221, 223, 237, 258, 303 sqq., 334. 335. 391.
Pelagians, 239 sq.
Penance, 245, 268.
Pepuzians, 256.
Permanence of the Real Presence, 128 sqq.
"Perpetual Prayer," 140.
Perrunezzi, J., 151.
Perrone, 351.
Pesch, Chr., S. T. joe
Pesch, T., S. J., 157–182
Petavius, 238. 57> 82,

Peter Lombard, 200.
Peter Mogilas, 203.
Peter of Blois, III.
Peter of Dresden, 246.
Peter, St., 19.
Philotheos Bryennios, 322.
Pliotius, 81, 316 sq.
Pierre d'Ailly, 119.
Pierre de Bruis, 81.
Pissy, A., 151.
Pistoia, Jansenistic Council of (1786), 117, 118, 345, 392.
Pius IV, 248.
Pius VI, 118, 345, 392.
Pius VII, 211.
Pius X, 243 sq., 245.
Plate!, 366.
Polycarp, St., 58.
Predication, Mode of, 158 sqq.
Preparation required for Communion, 270 sq.
Presence of the Eucharistic Body in space, 170 sqq.
Priests, 256 sqq., 261 sq., 280 sq.
Priscilla, Catacomb of St., 84.
" Private Masses," 345, 388.
Productio, 127.
Prov. IX, 5—17 sq.
Psalm, XXT, 300 sq.
Pseudo-Ambrose, 200.
Pseudo-Dionysius, 97.
Pusey, Dr., 121.

Q

" *Quam Singulari,"* Decree of Pius X, 243 sq.
Quantity in its relation to substance, 153 sqq.; Internal and external, 165 sqq.
" *Qui pridie quant pateretur," 207.*

R

Rasperger, Chr., 33.
Ratherius, 47.
Rationalists, 50.
Ratramnus, 46.
Real Presence. The, 9 sqq.; As a fact, 10 sqq.; Proof from S. Scripture, tosqq.; The promise, 10 sqq.; The institution, 23 sqq.; Proof from Tradition, 45 sqq.; Totality of the Real Presence, 88 sqq.; Operative cause of the, 102 sqq.; Permanence of the, 128 sqq.; Speculative discussion of the mystery of the, 143 sqq.
Receiving the Eucharist, Different ways of, 267.
Reischl, 313.
Renaud, Theophilus, 231.
Renaudot, 55, 211.
Renz, Fr., 283.
Replicatio aequivalens productioni, 123.
Replication, 178 sq.
Reproductio, 127.
Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, 139-
Resurrection, The Eucharist a pledge of a glorious, 232 sqq.
" Retransubstantiation," 134·,
Reviviscence of the Eucharist, 224 sq.
Rhabanus Maurus, *40, too.*
Rohling, 347·.
Rome, Council of (1059), 52·
Kosmini, 236, 266.
Rossignol, 163.
Rupert of Deutz, 114.

S

" Sacramental Expressions in the Bible, 39 sqq.
Sacramental union between the Eucharistic Body and the species, 160 sq.
Sacramentarian disputes, 33·
Sacrament of the Altar, 3.
Sacrament, The Holy Eucharist as a, 31 sq.. 185 sqq.: Definition, 185 sqq.; Matter. 189 sqq.; Form, 198 sqq.; Effects, 218 sqq.: Minister of consecration. 255 sqq.; Minister of distribution, 261 sqq; Recipient. 264 sqq.: Objective capacity of recipient, 265 sqq.;

Subjective worthiness of recipient, 267 sqq.
Sacramentum permanens. 133.
Sacramen lum saeramento runi,

"Sacra Tridentina Synodus," Decree of Pius X, 243.
Sacrifice, Explanation of term, 272 sqq., 277 sqq.; Constituents of a, 279 sqq.; Definition of a, 286; Different kinds of, 287 sqq.; The Mass, 292 sqq.
Sacrifice, The Holy Eucharist as a, 272 sqq. to end of volume.
Sacrificial intent, 278 sq.
Saguens, J., 151.
Saints, Masses in honor of the, 378 sqq.
Salmanticcnses, 355.
Samonas of Gaza, 211.
Sansevcrino, 181.
Sara, 33, 35.
Sarcophagy, 90.
Sasse, 367.
Schanz, 238.
Scheeben, 283, 353, 369.
Schell, 146, 203.
Schmid, Fr., 347.
Schncid, 181.
Schopenhauer, 158.
Schouppe, 347, 367.
Scotists, 123 sq.
Scottis, 43,119,181,207, 393.
Scotus Eriugena, 47, 52, 81.
Secchi, 157.
Second intention in saying Mass, 392.
Sense functions exercised by Christ in the Eucharist? 173 Sq.
" Separatione facta," 95 sqq.
Simar, 356 sq.
Simeon of Thessalonica, 236.
Sins, Mortal, Preservation of the soul from, by the Holy Eucharist, 229 sq.
Sins, Venial, Forgiven in the Holy Eucharist. 229, 394 sq.
Smith. Sydney F., S. J., 253.
Socinians, 50.
Soto, Dominicus, 98, 343, 396.
Species, Sacred, Whether they participate in the adoration rendered to our Lord in the Bl. Sacrament, 141 sq.
Spiritlike mode of existence of the Eucharistic Body, 100 sq., 162 sqq.
Spiritual delight a secondary effect of the Holy Eucharist, 227 sq.
Stentnip, 347.
Stephen of Autttn, in.
Stercoranists, 160 sq.
Stockl, 363.
Suarez, 98, 105, in, 145, 148, 165, 172, 181, 200, 201, 224, 226, 240, 252, 283, 288, 353 sqq., 362, 392.
Sylvester II, 47.
Sylvius, 362.

T

Table of the Lord, 3.
Taborites, 246.
Tamburini, 366.
Temporal punishments due to sin, Are they remitted by the Eucharist? 230 sq., 395 sq.
Tepe, 231, 367.
Tertullian, 59, 70, 75. 200, 250, 324. 375. 377, 379-
Thalhofer, 356 sqq.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 73.
Theodoret, 71, 73. 121, 150·
Theories regarding the metaphysical essence of the Mass, 350 sqq.
Theophoric processions, 139.
Thomas, St., On the Eucharist as the greatest of Sacraments, 4 sq.; On the words of institution, 43; On the manner of existence of Christ's Eucharistic Body, 101; Author of Eucharistic hymns, 140; On absolute accidents, 145. 155; On the quantity of the Eucha-V,st'c B9"ξ· !<>4; On how the Body of Christ becomes pres-

ent in the Eucharist, 169; On the invisibility of Christ's Body, 172; On multilocation, 181 ; On the use of unleavened bread, 193; On the use of water with the wine, 196 sq. ; On the words of consecration, 200; On what words are essential in the form of consecration, 209; On the secondary effect of the Holy Eucharist, 227 sq. ; On the influence of the Eucharist upon concupiscence, 230 ; And upon temporal punishments due to sin, 230; On Easter Communion, 242 ; On Communion under one kind, 252; On the minister of distribution of the Eucharist, 262; On unworthy Communion, 268 sq. ; On the Eucharistic fast, 270: On venial sin as an impediment to the effects of the Holy Eucharist, 271 ; On sacrifices, 278, 288; On the Mass in its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, 335 ; On the Consecration, 346; On the destruction of the sacrificial victim, 354; On an effect of the Mass, 394.

Thomists, 123 sqq., 182, 209 sq.

Tobias, 31.

Toledo, Council of (675), 250.

Tongiorgi, 157.

Totality of the Real Presence, 88 sqq.

Tournely, 343, 386.

Touttée, A., O. S. B., 211.

Transitory Sacraments, 133 sq.

Transubstantiation, 65, 66, 67, 82, 99, too; Definition of, 103 sqq.; History of the word, hi sq; Dogmatic bearing of, 112 sqq.; Proof from Scripture, 116 sqq.; Theological controversies. 123 sqq.

Tree of life, 290.

Trent, Council of, 6, 22, 52 sqq., 75, 89. 9-, 94. 96, 98. 00. 108. 109 sq·. I'', 117 sq., 129 sq.. •M, 133. 136,137, 140,146.147 s,i·· '5A 177 »q.. 194.195. W» π/?. 202, 203,218,222, 229.232, 237. 238, 241, 242, 243. 247 sq., 249. 252, 257, 258. 261. X-7, 20». 30b, 3'4 sq., 333, 336, 337, 3.A 341, 343. 345. 34^». 35«. 302, 372, 378, 379. 382. 387. 388, 390, 393. 394, 395.

Τρώγ«<ρ, iJ,

Trullo, Council in (692), 196, 266.

u

Ubtquitarianism, 117.

Ulloa, 366.

Union of the soul with Christ, the principal effect of the Holy Eucharist, 220 sqq.

Unleavened bread for the Eucharist, 191 sqq.

Unworthy Communion, 268 sq.

Urban IV, 140.

Utraquists, 22, 246 sqq.

V

Value of the Mass, 381 sqq.

Varignon, 163, 164.

Vasquez, 98, 114. "9. t-'5. 148, 172,283,288,350 sqq·. 367.384.

Vercelli, Council of (1050), 52.

Viaticum, 2.

Victim of a sacrifice. Its transformation, 282 sqq.

Viogné, 164.

Vischer, 4.8.

Visits to the Blessed Sacrament, 140.

Viva. 366.

roturn sacramenti, 245.

W

Waldenses, 256,316.

Water added to the wine in the Eucharist, 195 sq.

Wiclif, 81, 140 sq., 272, 317.

Wieland, 325.

William of Auxerre, 9&

Wilpert, Msgr., 84.
Wine as an element of the Eucharist, 193 sqq.; Purity of Mass wine, 254.
Wiseman, Card., 36.
Witasse, 151.
Wundt, 158.

X

Xenajas, 83.

Y

YSAMBERT, 165, 230.

z

Zachæus, 260.
zjii, 313.
Ziska, 246.
Z'Ti _ ' <!·. 32, 33, 35, 39, 50.
54> 67> 81, 129, 315.